LFI 135

George B. Huntington
Berkeley School

Oct 13th 1866

Theology

Lectures of Bishop Williams

Preliminary

I Definition of Theology

Strict sense: (1) God and (2) His attributes
Wider sense: add (3) His works

Classification of God's works: I,' of Nature, II," of Grace.

I' (a) Bodies alone, inanimate things
(b) Spirits alone, the Holy Angels;
(c) the two united, Man.

II" their characteristic, Union unto God.
Twofold Division, (1) One absolute & intrinsic, of the human and divine Natures, in the Person of the Word.
(2) One extrinsic & partial, of the intelligent creature unto God, through the Holy Spirit; may be called Moral; the work of Holiness in man

The Holy Spirit is given,
(l) because of the Sacrifice & merits of Christ;
(m) in the Communion of the Church:
(n) by the Sacraments & means of Grace, rightly received.

This grace is the root & ground of Holiness;
(a') disposing the will, & enlightening the mind;
(b') working with the disposed will, and enlightened mind.

Opposed to this Holiness is the state of Sin; the former

issuing in Eternal Life, and the other in Eternal Death.

II Arrangement of Topics
The foregoing observations in part suggest and in part explain the arrangement which follows.

I" God; (A) His Existence; (B) His Unity; (C) His attributes; (D) the Holy Trinity in Unity

II" Works of Nature; (A) Angels; (B) Man.

III" Original Sin.

IV" Works of Grace

1. Jesus Christ; (a) His Incarnation, (b) His Atonement, (c) His Resurrection and Ascension. The connexions of these great facts doctrinally.
2. Justification
3. The Church, its Nature, Organization, &c.
4. The H.S., the Rule of Faith & Practice.
5. Sacraments and Means of Grace.
(a) Baptism, (b) the Lord's Supper; (c) Other means particularly confirmation.
6. The Holy Ghost as the life of all, working with Jesus Christ
7. Christian Graces and Virtues; under this head I shall treat of conscience & also of sin.

V". The Four Last Things - The reasons & connexions of this Arrangement cannot be given in a Syllabus #

\# For some admirable remarks on a Scholastic arrangement in Theology, see Bp. Pearsons Minor Wr. I. p. 1.

III Theological Common Places.

That is, sources of theological arguments: τόποι, topics.

The Anglican Church has ever held these; I.st Right Reason, II.d Holy Scripture, III.d Primitive Antiquity.

The arrangement adopted, because arguments from I.st prepare the mind to receive proofs from II.d, our view of which is confirmed by the testimony of III.d.

I.st Some would exclude, because of a supposed contradiction between it and Faith. But God gave us the former and made us capable of the latter. So, they are not in themselves contradictory. The true question, how to harmonize them; not by destroying Reason with the Papist, or Faith with the Infidel.#

II.d Of this τόπος, little need be said. All parties professedly admit them. The Papist mingles them, or overrides them with traditions, visions &c. Others run into their abuse by a licentious exercise of private judgement. Of both these, more anon.

III.d (On Primitive Antiquity) more must be said. Two classes of opponents (I.)a Papists (II.)d Puritans

\# On the identity of position of Papist and Infidel compare Newman's University Sermons passim with Hume's Essay on Miracles. On the whole topic, Hook. E.P. III. c. viii, & answer to Travers. Palmer on Development and Conscience; Butler's Anal. Part II. c. 6; Lord Bacon's Adv. of Learning, Book II; Tyler on Prim. Christ. Worship. Part I. c. i.

against these we take the ground of the Anglican Reformation. The Papist professes to revere antiquity, antiquity, practically scouts it, the Puritan professes to scout it, is often glad to employ it.

I.ª The Papist asserts (and has done so since the time of the Reformation) that God's word is contained in written Scripture and Universal tradition. This Univ. trad. was always found in the Doctrine and Practice of the existing Ch. in any given age.

1. In support of this tradition and Prac. the Fathers were appealed to. Forgeries and spurious compositions pressed into the service. But the appeal failed, and the Fathers were often silent.

2. To account for this silence, the theory of the Disciplina arcani was appealed to. But even if this did account for silence, it did not for evident ignorance and contrary views.

3. Then came the notion of Developement.* Note that

For the formal Roman Doctrine. Trent. Sess IV. Decree 1; Creed of Pius IV; Catechism of Trent. For Romish treatment of the Fathers: Newman's Prophetical Office of the Ch; comp. Ep. xc of Card. Hosius; Palmer on Develop. &c, p. 248; James corruptions of Fathers & Councils; comp Waterland, vol. v. p. 318, by '38. For the Disc. Arcan.: Bing. I. c. iv. § 7. 8: X. c. v; Palmer ut sup. p. 232. For Developement: Moehler's Symbolism, Pt. 1. c. v, & Newman's Essay; & compare with their positions, those in Bossuet's variations of Protestantism against Jurieu. D. Wordsworth's 1st ser. letters to M. Gondon; Mr Palmer on Dev. & Conscience. Essay of Mr Sewell Archer Butler: Prof. to Mob. 40 Days, Eng. Rev. & Xtn Remembr. Bull's com. on Petavius, in pref. to Def. Fid. Nic.

here are three theories propounded in three centuries, not only diverse, but contradicting and mutually destructive. All cannot be true at one and the same time.

(II^a) And here observe the inconsistency above noted; as also that we are mainly concerned with, objections are
1. negations. All are founded in misconception. 1 Appeal needless, since we are now by the help of Philosophy, Criticism, &c, in a better condition for interpreting Scripture than the early Fathers. True to some extent. But this nothing to the purpose; we do not appeal to Prim. Antiq. for the Exegesis of ~~particular~~ specific passages, but for testimony of doctrine. Opinions over & above this testimony stand on their own merits.
2 The Fathers are no more infallible than we. Reply again the appeal is for testimony, not individual opinion.
3 Appeal derogates from Supremacy of Scripture. Not at all it presupposes the Supremacy of H.S. and is an aid to reach their true meaning; and again it is made to witnesses not to judges.

(III)^a Two principles involved in the appeal, one general, & one specific.

1. In settling a disputed meaning in any document, we appeal to contemporaneous or nearly con. writers
2. The whole Church in all time cannot be in error on a fundamental doctrine. So, in a question as to the ~~authorship~~ Scripturalness of a given doctrine, if we can prove that the whole Church all along

up to a denial of it to which we can assign a date; or that it was never heard of or held, till a time on which our finger can be laid, do we not settle the question as to Scripturalness?

Sum. The appeal is not to (a) individual opinions of Fathers, but to their testimony; not to (b) the Fathers as judges but as witnesses; not to (c) single declarations, but united testimony; not to (d) the church at one time & one place, but in her universality in both regards; not to (e) the church as an infallible judge, but as an indefectible witness. For as, this testimony is summed in the Creeds & P. Book. Right Reason, Holy Scripture, Primitive Antiquity are thus brought together; & Reason, Faith & Authority are harmonized, in the union of logical deduction, Scripture teaching, & the testimony of Antiquity.#

\# Com. of Vincent of Lerins. Hopkins End of Controversy &c. Letters II & XV; App. to Bp. Jebb's Sermons.

Topic I God

A His existence — Constitutive idea, self-existence – what the Schoolmen called aseitas: He is ens a se: "I am that I am" Proof not here alleged from Scripture, because that presupposes God's existence; considered from the point of Reason.

1. Starting point. All nations, everywhere & in all time, have believed in God.

This universal consensus is a strong a priori argument in favor, & presents the problem, how to account for it.

Unless of the Atheist will not try to account for it or fails on trial his cause is lost. We not bound to prove it, he bound to give sufficient reasons against it. But we can account for it, while he cannot.

2. We can account for this consensus by
a intuitive convictions
b a supposed original revelation
c the legitimate operations of reason. Any one of these if established is enough; a fortiori all are overwhelming.

a Some have termed "a" the innate idea of God[#] We mean by it that when the idea of God is presented to the human mind it is naturally accepted without going through trains of reasoning to establish it. Men do not reason themselves into a belief in

---

[#] Objections – Thos Aquinas, cont Gent. lib i c. 11 { Owens Theol
Pearson, Creed, art i. { Oxon 1661 / Lib i cap. 4 / 2d ed ...
Formerly, striking quot. Plato, Plotinus, Jamblicus & Cicero ... 1752

God, but out of it. Now this fact is a cogent argument in favor of a belief wh. so actually meets the conditions of the human mind. And the witness of conscience goes along with it, deepening & strengthening it. This fact then will explain the consensus above noted, provided we can account for the beginning of the belief; for once attained, it could be communicated.

6 "b" transmitted along the generations. No inherent improbability in it, & it exactly meets the conditions of the case. An originally perfect truth divinely communicated to men, transmitted by tradition wd end in a vast variety of beliefs in all wh. there wd be a witness to the central & original truth thus variously corrupted.* Here I only state this as an hypothesis; it can be proved of course to those who listen to the H. S. But until some other hypothesis is ad~~mitted~~duced wh. better fulfils the conditions & explains the phenomena of the case, this may claim consideration, by a well known principle in scientific research.

c — not that men must wade go through with them before they believe in God. Practically the great use of this head is to show those who by illicit processes of reason have been led into quasi-Atheism that legitimate ratiocination leads to Theism.*2

*1&2 Reasons Minor Works vol i p. 16.

Matter exists
Matter is inert
Therefore since matter is seen in motion we must suppose an energetic cause external to it, which must therefore be spiritual or immaterial; & as the movements of matter are designed (evidently), the cause must be intelligent.

In other words starting with the inertia of matter we trace up from one to another moving cause to God.

Everything which is caused is limited & its mode bounded. If matter came into existence uncaused it would be boundless = infinite. Vid Jackson Chap II Lib VI

-1- Form of the argument logically, a posteri. & not a priori.
-2- Kinds of proof
a Metaphysical
b Physical
a All existences within our cognizance are contingent & variable i.e. they depend upon other things & are continually changing. Starting from this fact then, one
(1) of three things is true: either (1) these contingent variable things existed from all eternity, wh. is an absurd supposition; or
(2) there was a time when nothing existed, wh. compels the further conclusion that not only was something created fr. nothing, but also by nothing; or
(3) beside & beyond these variable & contingent things, something has ever existed not contingent & variable. These hypotheses are exhaustive, & we are drawn logically to the last. This compels one of two further conclusions:
(i) the eternity of matter as such
(ii) the existence of God. But (i) can never satisfy the conditions of the case; so that we are again drawn to the latter & shrined from the impossibility of explaining how the eternal & immutable was changed by itself into the contingent & variable.
b This proof is well put by Paley, - & endorsed by the common sense of mankind; - i.e. that design proves a designer. This argument was used by the early Xtn. apologists & writers.

Trench Miracles p. 59 says "All justice requires it to be acknowledged that (Spinoza) does not bring down & resolve God into Nature, but rather takes up & loses nature in God."

It is triple in character
[1] Harmony of Nature with itself
[2] Adaptedness of Nature to Mans physical & mental needs
[3] Adaptedness of Nature to Man's intellectual & moral constitution. Each one of these heads cumulative in its character, & each element is also cumulative while the cumulation where all the three with all their parts are combined is overwhelming.

We claim now that we have given a sufficient and the only sufficient explanation of the fact & the phenomenon wh. we set out with. Can the unbeliever approach it? #

3 Atheism is hardly likely to meet us now as a formal & digested system. Two intellectual forms:
a Systems of Cosmogony
b Pantheism
a Materialistic in character. Answer involved in what has gone before. — Vestiges of Creation
b — principle stated by Spinoza, that there is in the universe one simple substance under the two modifications of thought & extension. Under the 1st it is mind; under the 2d matter. This universe exhausts possible entity; therefore God is everything, everything is God; verifying the words of Athanasius, Multitudo Numinum, Multitas deorum! Moreover there is no such thing

See next page

as right a wrong.

*[2] For God is immanent in everything, & all that occurs in mind & matter is a necessary evolution of God.

The Atheism or quasi Atheism usually met is not intellectual so much as moral. It is that of those who w'd be glad if there were no God, so they c'd live in sin with safety. Conscience is to be approached here, not intellect. Indeed, the question sh'd be always — so far as the logical argument is concerned — avoided in the pulpit.*[3]

---

*(preceding page) On the whole question; Pearson on Creed Art. I.; Beveridge on the Art. Art. I; Bentley's Boyle Lectures. There are few points that have escaped the attention of the Fathers. Thompson's Jt. Theism; Samuel Parker, de Deo et Providentia; Pearsons Minor Works, vol. i; the Manuals of Doct. Theology, I do not refer. On the Physical argument specifically: Dr Whewell's Astronomy &c in ref. to Nat. Theol. On the argument fr. Nature & Man's Intellectual & Moral Character some suggestive passages in Butler's Anal. (P. I, c. 4 & 5;) Trench on the Parables, Introd. c. 2.; Wordsworth's Excursion.

*[2] Tennemann's & Morell's Hist. of Philos; Hallam's Introd. to Lit. of Europe; Jouffroy's Introd. to Jt. Ethics; Thompson's Jt. Theism, Pt. 1, c. 6; Articles Jn Remembrancer 1847, & Chr. Rev. Jan '49 & July '51

[3]* Jackson's Origin of Unbelief, &c. Sec. 1; Burke vol 5; p. 5: Oxf. 1844

B
His Unity

1 The term to be defined, we distinguish betw. specific, & numerical or exclusive Unity. The former distinguishes one individual of the same species fr. all others. The latter is predicated of a being who is so one that all other beings are excluded fr. participating in his essential nature; he is Genus & Species: this is God's Unity.#

2 Natural Reason, working rightly, comes to this result; while as matter of fact, it is very likely to work wrongly & requires the constant correction of revelation. Principal use of rational arguments to correct illicit processes. Two forms again of argument

a Metaphysical

b Physical

a We start fr. this point, viz. that God's existence being admitted, perfection becomes a constitutive idea, so that not to conceive of him as perfect is not to conceive of Him at all. An ens a se, not a perfect ens, would involve a contradiction. Suppose then two perfect entities; there must be some difference to make them two; this difference either a perfection or an imperfection; to predicate either of either being involves the assertion of imperfection.

Or again suppose as above: then one cd exist without the other, or he cd not: if he cd not, he

\# Jackson on Divine Essence or Attributes; Bk 6. ch. 3.

a popular & good but nothing new in it.

he would not be perfect; if he did the other would not. In general any doctrine but that of God's unity destroys this const. idea of perfection. #1

6. This is the necessary complement of the same argument under the previous head (A.6.) If evidences of design prove an intelligent cause, evidences of oneness of design indicate one intelligent cause. One harmonious system no more likely to proceed fr. many intelligent designers than fr. "a fortuitous concourse of atoms" #2

3 H.S. is so entirely express that no special references need be given. Alleged difficulties are

(a) the use of the plural Elohim; but this is settled by Deut. 6.4 "Jehovah our Elohim is one Jehovah"

(b) Ps. 82.1,6; but here the Psalmist speaks of earthly judges;

(c) 1 Cor. 8.5: but here the Apostle has in mind nominal or false gods #3

#1 The Fathers are very full on these points & quote the philosophers as holding the unity. Tertullian adv. Marc. Lib. 1; Lactant. Inst. I.c. 3a; Athanas. cont. Gent; Boetius de Trin; Greg. Nyss. Prolog. Lib. Catech; Anselm, Monolog. c. 3. These are given as specimens only.

#2 Pearson on Creed. Art. I, Minor Works, vol. 1. Sect 11; Heurtley on the Creeds, vol 1. p. 116.

#3 Horsley's Biblical Criticism. Gen. iii. cf. for (b) Joh. 10.34,35.

a Probably not only completed the incarnation but denial of anything outside, [as] necessarily

4 Two positions which bear on this matter & are very dangerous, taking with the superficial & those who mistake obscurity for profundity.

(a) Polytheism is sometimes called the oldest belief, out of wh. men have developed Monotheism. Many who are called believers say this. It is simple nonsense; Monoth. is the original truth, Polyth. the human conception.

(b) It is also said that God was revealed to the Jews as a merely national God. That some & many of the Jews did so conceive of God is altogether likely; that He was so revealed is false; see Deut. xxxii. 39; Is. xliv. 6.

5[c] Errors are Polytheism, Dualism, Tritheism. 1st is most ancient; usually, not necessarily, accompanied with idolatry. Two periods to be considered, Ante-[a] & Post-diluvian[a]. Over the former a great mystery hangs (Gen. 4. 26); as to the latter, the earliest form probably Hero worship; this natural on account of the promise in Gen. 3. 15; then the souls of those heroes being supposed to animate the stars, led to Sabianism, or the worship of the heavenly hosts; fr. these two, materialistic forms developed.#

Dualism to be regarded as a heathen error, or a heresy in the Ch. In its former aspect it came prob. in part fr. traditions

---

Cf. Gen. 4. 26; Faber's Dispen. Vol. 1. p. 270; Jarvis' Ch. of Red. p. 14 & 27; Faber's pagan idolatry; Faber on Dispens. Bk 1. c. 7; Forbes of Corse Instr. Hist. Theol. Lib 8. c. 7; Gale's Court of Gentiles, Bk 2. (full of theory indentable); Jarvis' Ch. of Red. p. 26. On relations of heathen mythology to ... Maurice's Religion of the World; Williams' ... Scholar & Sermon prefaced

Cf. Trench's Works Vol. 1. p. 164 Edin. '47

As we cannot say heat is hot, so we cannot say God is aliquid. God alone is the true one; all creatures are receptacles of his life.

"That the totality of every conceivable excellency & perfection should be contained after a manner far more excellent in unity indivisible, than if their natures, which they hold thus in common were laid out in several, without any bounds prescribed, besides infinities proper to each kind" Jackson Lib vi. cap iv. sect. 19.

Approximate to a conception of Divine attributes by a denying of imperfections

Nominalists & realists

of the fall of angels, in part fr. traditions of the God was descended from Seth & Cain; & in part fr the internal & external strife, wh. men cannot but see. Doubtful whether the heathens held in all cases to two equal powers. This principle of Oriental philos. met the nascent faith & the infant Ch., & gave rise to the endlessly multiplied subdivisions of Gnosticism: it no longer lives.

Dualism exists only as a heresy in the Ch., & will be considered in its place.

C

The Attributes of God

1. Definitions. God is one perfect & indivisible entity; but thus we cannot conceive Him. Finity cannot understand infinity. Hence we look at the Divine Essence now from one point, now fr. another; & when we express these views in words, then we express attributes. An attribute then is a property resulting fr. our mode of conceiving of the Divine Essence, & predicated of it in order to assert its perfection & deny to it any imperfection. Yet these attributes are not to be considered as existing only in our own minds; they are founded in the fact of the Divine Nature. Thus Omnipotence is the Divine Essence, as free fr. all obstacles to action: Eternity is the same, as free fr. limit & succession in time.*

2. A very important & abstruse question, How do the

1* Turretin Theol. vol i, p. 169: Pearson's Minor Works vol i. pp. 37-8

Divine Attributes differ (a) fr. the Essence & (b) among themselves? Observe, there are two modes of differing: (1) really, when things are diverse in essence, & (2) virtually, when they are regarded in connexion with the various results they work. Now we say the attributes differ fr. each other & fr. the Divine Essence only virtually; i.e. God's Essence acting in one direction & under one set of relations is called Justice, in another Mercy, &c. We should not say God punishes by his Mercy, or compassionates by his Justice; & yet it is all the time one Divine Essence that we are concerned with; & the Attributes are only expressions of the operations of that Divine Essence acting under different relations, & working so to speak—in different lines.

3 This is of course a deduction of the reason: why insist on it.? I answer, Because of the fearful consequences which result from the assertion of the contrary. These are admirably stated by Dean Jackson On the Attributes & Essence, Bk 6. C.4. * §4

4 Our next step is to obtain some division sufficient for the purposes of study. The subjects are for meditation rather than investigation: yet meditation presupposes some degree of knowledge. Most general division into Incommunicable & Communicable. These words employed in a specific sense. In-=commun., those, nothing answering to a really resembling wh. is found in created beings. Commun. those of wh. resemblances & vestiges are found in creatures.

* Comp. Pearson Minor works, vol. i, p. 39. &c; Fenelon(?) Tome 3, Chap 5. August de Trin. Lib 6. C.6; Lib 15: C.8. Anselm. Trinity.

Communication is double: (a) real or essential, where intrinsic being is communicated, & (b) of similitude & analogy, in respect to effects & operations. Communicatio idiomatum will be considered in its proper place. I give for this basis the following division, not as exhaustive — pro tempore — but as sufficient for study.

I Incommunicable attributes: no likeness in creatures:
(1) Simplicity — out of wh.
(a) Incorporeity; (b) Impassibility (c) Immutability
(2) Infinity: (a) in regard to time, eternity (b) & to presence, Immensity.

II Communicable attributes; likeness in creatures: the analogy lies in these respects:
(1) To Essence, & this gives us Life.
(2) To Faculties, & here we have (a) Intellect or knowledge & (b) Will; & with these are connected (c) Power (d) Providence (e) Predestination.
(3) To Habits, & this gives (a) Justice & (b) Goodness.

Specific Consideration of the foregoing Division

I (1) Denies composition, asserts uncompoundedness & indivisibility. There may be various kinds of composition; e.g. (a) physical, of matter & form, substance & quality, or quantitative parts
(b") metaphysical of act & power, essence & existence
(c") logical of genus & species, &c this division not

Passion implies a burning & heat; when in God there is a vehemence such as man's passion would exhibit we by a figure speak of God's passion.

° Not because Mill is a very good authority but if he, a fortiori others

asserted as exhaustive, but illustrative. General formula of argument: all these or any other forms of composition limit, modify, or differentiate that of wh. they are predicated. But anything thus lim. mod. or diff. is imperfect; therefore comp. cannot be predicated of God. This attribute "proved by" rather than "read in" H.S.[#1]

(a) – a result of Simp., denies to God a body & therefore matter. Distinguish betw. substance & matter: the former by no means denied to the Godhead. H.S. clear on this point[#2]. Two objections; (1) Bodily members attributed to God: (2) Man was made in the image of God. Both these alleged of the ancient Anthropomorphites[#3] & the modern Mormons. As to (1) we say that the language of H.S. used is "figurative"[#4], in condescension to our ignorance. As to (2) it is an obscure passage but Rom. 1:23 & Deut. 4:15 prove that it is not to be understood materially or physically.[#5]

(b) Impassibility: denies to God human passions & the capacity of suffering. We argue it on rational grounds because either of these things implies change, & change, as we shall soon see, cannot be predicated of God. H.S. is very clear. The attribution of passion to God comes under the head of figurative language.

#1 Aug. de Trin. Lib. 5: c. 4; Lib. 6, c. 6.
#2 Mill's Logic. p. 38. Am. Ed. John 4:24; cf Luc. 24. 39; Deut 4.15 – Rom 1.23.
#3 Luces in Hebr; Pearson's Minor Works, vol. 1. p. 47; Mosheim's Hist. Cent. 10 p. II. c. 3: § 4; Elder David Moffat's Mormon catechism, publ. 1852, p. 42.
#4 Jones of Nay. on Fig. Lang. Ser.
#5 Anthropom. in Psalm 118.

but all these are denials of imperfection or as Peacon (?. ?. I. p. 79) "non est aliquid negativum, sed positivum aliquid fundans negationem."

Aristotle says, a 4th a change from 1 nonexistence to another nonexistence

The attribution of suffering to God will be explained later on under communicatio idiomatum.[#1]

(c) Immutability denies all change in God fr. one state or condition to another, whether occasioned by anything in Himself, or anything extrinsic to Himself. On grounds of reason we start fr. the philosophic description of change.[#2] There are three possible changes: (1) from non ex. to ex. (2) from ex. to non ex. & (3) from one existence to another. Now (1) asserts a time when God was not, (2) a time when he will not be; (3) would give him something wh. he had not, or take from him something wh. he had, either way destroying perfection.[#3]

The teaching of H.S. is abundant.[#4] And now to descend to particulars we may consider God in ref. to (1) His being, (2) his substance, (3) his rational nature, the vital acts of which are to know & to will & (4) his being the principal cause. In all these respects we assert immutability in God.

#1 Burnet & Beveridge on Art I. Num 23.19. Acts 14.15.
#2 Aristot. Phys. Bk. 5: c1; Pearson, vol. i. p. 96.
#3 Aug. in Joh. tract 15. ?
#4 Num 23.19; 1 Sam. 15:29; Ps. 102. 26.27; Mal. 3.6; Jas, 1.17.

Non creatorship does not involve non possibility of creation

Let g = God, c = capacity to create & a = actuality of Creation

$c - a$ in its relation to g is different from $c + a$ in its relation to g.

g = God $m - m$ p = power

$m - p$ to g in relation is different from $m + p$ to g

(1) As to this: a change from non-existence wd. destroy his Aseitas & contradict the declarations of S.S. that he is from everlasting.#1 On the other hand, that course change would assert φθορά of the Divine essence, wh. is declared to be ἄφθαρτος.#½

(2) Change in God's substance wd. destroy his simplicity.

(3) Mutability of will or knowledge will be considered when we reach those topics.

(4) Two difficulties raised here: (a) God from not being a Creator, became a Creator; the terms are contradictory & the passage from one to the other involves change. Origen felt this so strongly as to assert the eternity of creation. But observe there was no intrinsic change in God; the change was all outside of Him; in place of nothing outside of God there was something: external relations were changed not essential being; the very act of Creatorship was not immanent, but went out fr. God. (b) A change in the Divine substance is asserted in the Incarnation. But again it was only a change of relation "Not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood ~~into~~ union with God." To hold immutability correctly, we must hold with it the Divine liberty, else we run into absolutism & its fatal errors.#2 Difficult to harmonize the two ideas; yet

---

#1 Ps. 90.2. Hab. 1.12, Rev. 21.6 &c.

#2 Schlegel's Phil of Life p. 60. Am. edit.

#½ Rom 1.23, 1 Tim 1.17, 1 Tim 1.16. Comp. C 11.26.29

o Greater perfection to be free. Immutability is the ground & liberty the perfection. Absolute both — freely immutable is truly imperfection — but immutably free is a perfection.

m safest eloquence, silence; our words wary & few.

Liberty

is as clearly revealed as immutability.[1] It is nothing new to be required to hold two truths difficult to be reconciled.[2] The question is of course a very abstruse one: Dean Jackson[3] says all that can be said; while on all such topics we shall do well to remember Mr Hooker's wise & weighty counsels.[4]

(2) [5] Infinity: the second great incommunicable attribute. It is argued logically fr. His essence, His power & His perfection. Form of argument same as ~~before~~ above. Used as an adjective may be predicated of any attribute. We may here consider God's essence, & perfections. As to the former He is infinite; (1) Originally as there is nothing anterior or superior to Him. (2) Formally, in that His essence is ἄπειρος; (3) Virtually because the sphere of His action is limitless, & He admits no coordinate concurrence of any other cause. As to the latter, He is infinite (1) formally, (2) eminently, (3) virtually.[6]

Consider more infinity in resp. to (a) Duration & (b) Presence.

---

[1] Job. 42. 2; Ps. 135: 6; Is 46. 10; Jer. 18. 4 seq.; Dan. 4, 35: Eph. ...

[2] Sewell's Chr. Morals. cc. 8. 9.

[3] Attrib. Bk. 6. c. 9.

[4] Eccl. Pol. Bk. 1, c. 2. § 2

[5] Job 11. 7. 8; Ps. 145: 3

[6] Zanchius, vol. 1. p. 177 Or expl. in Pearson Minor Works, vol. I. § 6.

[a] Aeternitas est interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio.

(a) Eternity sometimes used in Scripture of things wh. have a beginning but shall have no end & sometimes used loosely.[#1] Here we speak scientifically. Boetius definition unsurpassed; the Entire perfect & simultaneous possession of a Life, wh. has neither beginning nor end.[#2] Three things here denied to the Divine Essence (1) Beginning (2) End (3) Succession. No questions as to the first two.[#3] As to the third there has been a doubt, tho not in earlier times. It began I believe with the Remonstrants & they are followed by Tillotson[#4] & S. Clarke.[#5] But Hooker[#6] Jackson[#7] & Pearson[#8] accept the definition. You need not hesitate long between such leaders. The argument as grounds of reason, refers to the principle that there is no real difference between Div. Essence & attributes. Then what may be predicated of the one may be of the other: so succession. But succession involves (1) change fr. past to present & fr. present to future: & (2) capability of being measured which denies Immutability & Simplicity & Infinity & End. Succession cannot therefore be predicated of the Essence & so not of the attributes & so not of

---

#1 Gen xvii 8.9: Gen XLIX: 26: Deut. XXXiii. 15: Hab. iii. 6 [16?] Matt XXV. 46. John vi. 54

#2 De Cons. Phil. Lib V. ~~[illegible]~~ vi.

#3 Ps xc. 2. Is XLi. 4 XLiV. 6. XLViii. 12. Rev. i. 8 iv. 8

#4 Sermon Cii

#5 Demonstr. Attrib. Prop. V

#6 E.P. V. LXIX

#7 WT. p 60

#8 WT. 105 ?

a limitation not understood but not to be admitted

His presence too is absolute not relative #4

eternity. Rev. iv. 8 [1.4] & similar passages seem against this. But only a mode of speech for our capabilities. #1 This attribute belongs to God alone. #2

(6) Immensity or Incomprehensibility denies all limitation in or by Space to God's Substantial presence. Differs fr. Ubiquity or Omnipresence in that the latter has reference to created space, it has not. The true question is not whether God is everywhere in His power (potentia) or in His knowledge (praesentia) but whether He is present in His Essence (entia) wherever anything can possibly be.

First Ref: fr. the H.S.: its testimony very clear. #3 If we choose to take it on grounds of reason, we may take very into obj. Reason #4 - Whatever is is somewhere, for that which is nowhere is not; God therefore is somewhere. That wh. is somewhere is either limited by space or it is not: if not, then it is everywhere, without any reference to space: if it is, then the Divine Essence is limited, but wh. is limited is imperfect. Or, again God if He is in one part of the Universe & not in another either can pass from

---

#1 St. Aug. in John. Tr. xcix Jackson V. p. 77.
#2 Pearson Min. Wr. i. 106 f.
#3 Ps cxxxix 7. 8. cxlv. 3. 1 K. viii 27, Is lxvi. 1. Jer xxiii, 24. observe that "heaven & earth" in Heb. comprehends all places actual or possible Job xi. 8. 9: cf. Is. xl. 12; Heb. i. 3. Acts xvii. 27. 28
#4 Min. Wr. i. 8 ff. (vid 810)

Here would belong God's constant presence in all time & the continual presence & him of all that ever was or will be. "Times passing exonerate themselves into the ocean of this infinite duration without enlarging it; times coming incessantly flow from it without diminution of it." Jackson vol V p. 104.

that part to another or He cannot. If He cannot then He lacks power; if He can, He is mutable. Or again combining H.S. & reason, we may say H.S. ~~asserts~~ asserts Omnipresence & at the same time asserts Unity; this renders multitudinousness impossible & leaves only the possibility of Immensity.

II ~~Life~~

(1) Seems needs no explanation & little defence: to assert the existence of an intelligent creature is to assert life. H.S however is [illegible] express. (a) it asserts it outright.#1 God swears by His Life#2 & propounds oaths by His Life#3 & His Life is appealed to in proof that He is the true God, against all idols or false Gods.#4 The characteristic of the Life is that it is Self life, the highest conceivable form of Life.#5 By comparing Rom. XIV. 11 with the place quoted from the O.T. V.C. Is. XLV. 23. we shall see that His Life & Himself are synonymous terms.

(2) a Intellect or Knowledge. Certified both by Reason & Script. What conceivable idea can there be of God, knowledge being denied Him?

#1 Deut V. 26 II K. XIX 4. Ps. XLII. 2. LXXXIV. 2 Heb. III 12. etc

#2 Is. XLIX. 18. Jer. XLVI. 18

#3 Jer ~~~~ IV. 2. XII. 16

#4 Jer X. 10 Acts XIV. 15 1 Thess. I. 9

#5 John V. 26

he who runs may read it set forth in Scripture. Two special points [a]. the mode or nature [b]. the extent or object of God's knowledge. Of the [a] we may say it
[a] is perfect. of the [b] it is universal. 1. the nature, perfect. St. Aug #1 & after him Pearson #2 have well stated the rule by wh. we must be guided i.e. all processes & notions of knowledge wh. involve imperfection are to be removed & thus we reach the attribute; we start that is fr. human knowledge & excluding all that belongs to it qua human & created; we rest on what belongs to it qua knowledge. So we proceed on the two familiar principles so often employed already. Two things then specially excluded: #3 Opinions, wh. depend on comparing one thing with another in their external relations & Belief, wh. depends on testimony. The process indicated will bring out 5 great characteristics of Gods knowledge, considered per se. It is perfect ex vi naturae: intuitive, excluding the process of reasoning: simultaneous, excluding acts of memory: distinct, excluding all doubt or uncertainty: & immutable, excluding anything like change.

#1 Liber ii. ad Simplicianum c. 2
#2 M. W. 1. pp. 152, 153
#3 Pearson on Creed Art 1. Min. W. 1. p. 153

Sobe mm inegimatia qua se turpe

Note the privative character of this process: we do not positively lay out God's knowledge, for a direct consideration of it, for finite beings could not do this. We approach it indirectly & by this privative process, exclude those imperfections wh. inhere in human ~~knowledge~~ knowledge & so approximate

[6] to a just view of this aspect of the attribute. [6] 2. Extent or Object: Universal. Most general & exhaustive division here (a') God Himself - (b'') all possible things external to Himself. As to (a') it is hardly a subject even to be meditated upon. As to (b'') #[1] the latter, it is plain that all possible things external to God, were made by Him & are depend on His creations & in these H.S. is in general clear #[2]. Now these possible things may be considered (a') as to ~~quality~~ quantity, small or great, (b') as to quality, good or bad (c') as to logical predication, universal or singular. (d') as to time of existence, past, present, or future. (e') as to condition of existence, necessary or contingent.

No difficulties raised here except as to (1a) evil things (2a) singular things & (3a) future contingents. As to

(1a) the (1a) If man can know evil & not be injured by it a fortiori God may. The difficulty lies only in a wrong idea attached

(2a) to the word know. As to (2a), the objection is one of human

---

#[1] See Perrone Tract. 16. De Deo et attributis.

#[2] See i. 31. Job. xxviii. 24. Heb. iv. 13. etc

a In the Divine Essence all real effects, all events possible, whether necessary, casual or contingent, are eminently contained, the perfect knowledge of his own essence necessarily includes the perfect knowledge, not only of all things that have been are or shall be, but of all things that might have been or possibly may be. And as God's essence is present to every place, as it were an ubiquitary centre, so is his eternity or infinite duration indivisibly coexistent to every part of succession, & yet withal is round about it. He it is that drives things future upon us, being from eternity as well beyond them as on this side of them

See A.P. Peabody on Boyle in "Xty Religion of Nature"

(Stand on a height in early misty morning & see two mountain tops lighted up & connected by an unseen valley) – but of course totally imperfect as an illustration

judgement only. H. S. is distinct. #1 But really it only magnifies God's knowledge to say that small things as well as
(3rd) great are under his cognizance. The question as to God's knowledge of future contingents is much more important.

To state the question, observe that things are contingent or necessary, and that contingent things are contingent, either (1) in reference to their primary cause & thus all things are contingent upon God or (2) in ref. to their secondary cause, wh. under certain circumstances may, or under others may not produce them. The question then is, do these future things wh. are not necessary & wh. over & above their primary cause, God, depend on a secondary cause wh. may or may not produce them, so come within the scope of God's knowledge that He knows them as certainties? Socinus, Crellius & their school deny it. We affirm it. It is a point to be settled by Script. alone; it is outside the limits of safe reasoning. But Scripture #2 is express. The difficulty is simply a metaphysical one i.e. to reconcile God's foreknowledge & man's moral freedom. This is just what we cannot do. H. S. asserts both truths & they do not ex vi termini contradict each other. #3

#1 Matt. x. 29. 30. Heb iv. 13. Ps. cxlvii. 4

#2 Ps. cxxxix. 1-16. Jer. i. 5. Is. xli 22. 23. xlvi, 10 1. John iii. 20. Acts xv. 18. 1 Sam xxiii. 11. 12.

#3 Turretin L. 3. q. 12 Pearson Min. Wr. i. 166-205 a Jackson vol. v. 83-105

6, 1. First we need a sufficient definition. It is then obviously an act of wh. the intellect takes cognizance: this we know from ourselves. In us, it determines toward good or else toward evil. In a perfectly holy being the latter characteristic cannot exist, so cutting it off by the negative process above alluded to, we reach the idea that the Will of God is an intelligent act of the Divine Essence, ever determining freely & towards good.

2. The objects on wh. the will of God works must by His necessities be (1) God Himself. (2) all His creatures. But no cause of His Will can fr. the nature of the case be assumed: many mistake the reason of His act, or the modus operandi for the cause. Moreover God's Will imposes on some things a necessity, but others it leaves free & contingent.

3. As to how God's Will works in ref to Himself, it is not proper for us to enquire. We do know however that God by His will acting under His Intellect, must have given a Law to Himself. #'

4 As to the Will of God in ref. to us: we may make two divisions: (a) voluntas signi: (b) voluntas beneplaciti. The 1st is only a metaphor & means God's revealed moral Law, expressing the Divine Will. It has two aspects, toward good & toward evil, commanding the one & prohibiting the other. 2d is chiefly to be considered: It is properly the Will acting or willing. The great problem grows out

#' The whole of Hookers 1st Book Ecc. Pol. Sect 1. & II

St. Aug. De. Civ. Dei. XII.c.17. – in Illo, .. non alteram praecedentem altera subsequens mutavit aut abstulit voluntatem, sed una eademque sempiterna et immutabili voluntate res quas condidit, et ut prius non essent egit, quamdiu non fuerunt et ut posterius essent, quando esse coeperunt.

Bp. [illegible] rather believe in no God, than in an absolute God.

Calvinism – made the Dutchmen object to insuring the weather "to keep the hand of [illegible] down" & make the chances even.

of two statements of H. S. (a) God wills all men to be saved #[1] (b) all men are not saved #[2]. Now Calvinism in all its forms makes the ~~first~~ (a) a metaphor & universalism makes ~~(a)~~ ~~(b)~~ (b). Neither reconciles the two & perhaps nothing can; but we can all approximate a conclusion.

Let us divide the will into Antecedent (absolute) & ~~Conditional~~ Consequent (conditional), meaning by the former that aspect of the will under & by wh. anything is willed nakedly and abstracted from all circumstances & by the latter that aspect under & by wh. anything is willed considered with all its circumstances. Reason approves this it is not a mere conceit or dodging of the difficulty. Aquinas says "a thing nakedly & in itself is good often wh. under its circumstances & conditions becomes bad". It is good for a man to live, but murderers ought to die; it is good per se to bring cargo safe to port, but it is bad not to throw it overboard & save lives. Experience justifies this view. Neither does it make the will two or destroy the unity. Now apply this to the case and all the great difficulty ends. By His antecedent will God wills all men to be saved: by His consequent will condemns some at last. Nor is his antecedent will merely complacent or inactive: it provided a sacrifice for all men & offers to all sufficient means. In a word God is not an absolute but a moral being #[3]. Neither does this imply a defect in the will. - the absolute view would. Nor yet does

#[1] I Tim. II. 4.
#[2] II Thess. I. 8. 9.
#[3] Schlegel Phil. of Life

w = God's will m = man o = Obedience

w : m − o not = w : m + o.

it involve mutability; for the change is not in God, but in the creature; recur to the definition #1

5 A topic which naturally occurs here is the relation of God & evil. The very definition of will, prevents us from making God to will evil. The very creation of man as a moral agent, involves the possibility of evil: so too of angels. And this evil, God does not permit morally: i.e. by any relaxation of law: but only actually: i.e. by not taking away moral agency, or annihilating its results. Nor does He simply only allow it thus: He punishes for it & thereby magnifies His own power. #2 This point will come up again

C 1. Two words employed in theology. (1) potentia, the act of power & (2) potestas, the right of acting. We are concerned with the former, which is the capacity in the Divine Essence of doing what it willeth. H. S. asserts this power. #3

2 Object of this Power: what is possible to be done - this does not contradict Almightiness: God's perfectness makes some things impossible! i.e. to lie, to do wrong, to contradict, or to destroy himself. First limitation then nothing possible which interferes

#1 Hook. ap. to Travers. § 22. comp. Walton's Life: Pearson. Minor Th. vol I. Lect. § XXI. John Damasc. de Fide Orthod. lib II. Augustine de Spiritu et Litera, c. 23 & 33: Ambrose - Serm viii. on Ps. cxviii: Sermon on Eph 1: Jackson vol V, 14 & 41. Note that his objections to the distinction of Vol. Sig & Vol. beneplac. do not apply to the view given above: for according to it, the latter is the true expression of the former

#2 Jackson Vol. V. p. 300

#3 Ps. cxv. 3: Luke 1. 37. Matt. xix. 26.

with perfections. Again. He has established laws (1) as to the relation of his creatures to Himself: (2) as to their relation to themselves, (3) as to their relations to each other. Instances of impossibility: (1) that things shd. be independent of Him. (2) to exist & not exist, at one & the same time: (3) that a Father should be the child of his son.

3 To remove the apparent difficulty, observe, that the act of the Will precedes the act of Power, & that the very perfection of His Will prevents God from doing certain acts. Moreover any limitation of power wh. there is, is simply by the Law wh. God is to Himself, wh. He imposes on His creatures. "While He cannot do what no power can, He can do all wh. any power can"[#1]

d.1. The knowledge, the Will & the power of God unite in that attribute: we mean that oversight and ordinance of God wh. arranges, upholds & governs all things.[#2] It comprises therefore (a) the knowledge (b) the arrangement or adaptation of means to an end.

2 It may doubtless be argued on principles of Nat. Reason: from the character of God as good, wise & powerful: from the necessary dependence of created things upon their Creator; from the workings & relations of created things among themselves. Accordingly the best heathen philosophers have asserted it[#3]. Indeed none denied it except the Epicureans, & possibly the Stoics.

3 But Holy Scripture is very full. There are

#1 Jackson vol. v. p. 78 Turretin. Locus 3. Qu. 21

#2 Boetius de Consol. Philos. Lib. IV Sen. Qu. 6: m. & accidents

#3 Plato de Legibus. Lib. X. &c. Cic. de Nat. Deo II. 3

#1 Two symbols of God's providence wh. are very striking: (1) Jacob's Ladder & the Wheels of Ezekiel #2
4 The most important question relates to the way in wh. Providence works. Without entering into metaphysical refinements we may observe two extreme views: (1) of those who admit no intervention of 2d causes: but make the Divine action in all cases direct: (2) of those who make those 2d causes, wh they call Laws of Nature everything & exclude God from any participation in the Laws of the Universe. The 1st and to superstition: the 2d to Epicurean profanity. As to (1) the fact that God does employ means & 2d causes is obvious & patent: as to the 2d, the fact that Laws may seem to execute themselves, does not hinder their being laws; & natural laws mean only fixed & settled laws, while requiring an intelligent author, #3 & superintendence #4. The truth lies between the two, & is not hard to find - #5 In these the objection from the apparently unequal distributions of Providence is met. #6
5 Special Providence is unquestionably asserted in Matt x & Luke xii; but the phrase must be guarded from being misunderstood.

#1 Job xii, xxxviii, xxxix, xl. xli: Ps. xix. xci, cxlvii: Matt. vi. 25-32. Luke xii. 6-7: Acts xiv, 17.
#2 Ez. I. Gen. xxviii. 12. 13
#3 Butler's Anal. c. I. II
#4 Hook. E. P. Bk I c. iii § 4.
#5 Bp. Butl. Serm xix. Hooker Serm. on pride. Scott Xtian Life Pt ii. ciii
Augustin de civitat Dei. Lib I c. viii.
#6 Bp. Sanderson Serm on 1 Kings xxi. 27. the ad Populum.

It need not mean special interference; & men must always keep in mind the cautions of our Lord #1 We shall not go wrong in holding that God does lay out our lives for us, so that they are the best training we could have for eternity; while yet we are to remember that God's law, & not his providence is to be the rule of our lives, nor that if we still look for ~~primitive~~ punitive Providences we should exercise our ingenuity not for the benefit of our neighbours but on ourselves.

6. Not claiming to be a privy counseller to the Almighty, I regard it as no shame, to say that I do not understand His secret counsels and decrees. This topic I therefore look upon as one in which we cannot be too guarded and cautious.

1. Observe, that the question as between any and all views of predestination is a metaphysical one, and not involving an article of the faith. Hence, there is, and ever should be, room for wide differences in opinion.

2 Observe that while there is a distinction between the fatalist and the predestinarian, in that the one goes to philosophy for his ground principle and the other to revelation, yet they both represent mankind as acting by a law of necessity and not as free agents: and ~~that the~~ supposed necessity, is no proper rule for action. #2

3 Observe, ~~that~~ our underlying principle must be "Let

#1 Luke xiii 4 (not to apply providences to other people) See Sydney Smith on Methodism

#2 Butler Analogy Part I. c vi. Mozley Predest. Chap. 1.

Eph. 1 4 καθως εξελεξατο ημας εν αυτῳ προ καταβολης κοσμου, ειναι ημας αγιους καὶ αμωμους κατενωπιον αυτου, εν αγαπη προορισας ημας εις υιοθεσιαν δια Ι.Χ.

God be true and every man a liar"; i.e., God cannot mock us with universal offers of salvation, and promises of grace; what He says He offers, and gives and wills, He does offer & will & give.

4 Observe that God's knowledge of future contingents, and the distinction of His will into antecedent and consequent, while they do not explain the Divine Decrees, remove most of the difficulties attending them.

5 These things premised, I see no difficulty - not even calling into view what St Paul says or does not say in his Epistle to the Romans - in admitting that election may be one thing, and Predestination another; or at least that such a distinction may be taken if any one is disposed to make it; that election has reference to grace in this world & P. has reference to glory in the next; both meantime dealing with individual souls

6 Election then may be held, and no one will be very likely to dispute this, as the early Ch. held it. Its ideality - i.e., the ideas wh it presents, - is, the calling of men to the privileges of the Xtian covenant, in this world, intended to prepare them for glory in the next. Its causality - i.e., the reason why God allows some to come to these privileges, and suffers others never to receive them - is His own good pleasure, the counsels of wh. are not revealed to us.

7 Predestination, is, in this view, the allotment of individuals

& glory hereafter, may be held (however it can be) consistently with the following assumed facts.

a. Christ has redeemed all men

b. Redemption includes the possibility of salvation for all ~~men~~ the redeemed.

c. The word Reprobation, in the Calvinistic sense, is not found in any part of H. S. [Pearson M. W. Vol 1. p. 244]

d. It is distinctly asserted that the recipients of grace may fall away from it.#1

e. The word Predestination in H. S. is never applied to the Lost #2

f. Rom. IX, was not regarded for 4 centuries as involving the calvinistic doctrine #3

g. God foresaw, from all eternity by His knowledge of future contingents, that all the Saved would be holy & all the Lost unholy. #4

h. In this matter we must reason, so far as individual life and duty are concerned, ascendendo, i.e. from a holy life to a hoped predestination and not descendendo, i.e. from an holy life assumed predestination to any sort of life we please. #5

#1 Heb. X. 26, 27, 28 [Vid. cf. above & Pear. M. W.]

#2 Pearson M. W. Vol I. p. 247.

#3 " " " " " " 251

#4 Lectio XXIX. " " " .

#5 Cardwell's Conference p. 180.

8 As to a specific difficulty, concerning the XVIIth article of our ch. No man need fell it, unless he supposes, that there is no other meaning to the word predestination than the Calvinistic one. If there is, then the word may, per se, as well have that meaning in the article, as the Calvinistic: and it becomes simply a question of History, as to wh. meaning it really has. But historically it cannot mean Calvinistic #

(II) 3 a & b. Here it will be remembered the analogy lay in regard to Habits:

1 These attitudes must be held together, neither of them destroying or excluding the other.

App. Lawrences, Bampton lectures; Hardwicks History of the articles; Burnet & Browne on Art. XVII. Archb. Bancroft, True predestinates. Mozley August. Precedent. See ref. in Browne & Hardwick (if you have a long life to give to them)

D

The Holy Trinity [illegible] Unity

Arrangement of topics. (a) Preliminary Objections. (b) Inductive argument from H. S. (c) Test. of early ch. (d) Lang. of the Symbols & of theology (e) Errors ancient & modern.

(a) 1. Two to be noted. 1. the doctrine is contrary to our senses and our reason. Properly no mention can be made of senses for God in no way comes under their cognizance. Beyond our senses we admit; but so is God himself, whose existence is admitted. Contrary to reason, we deny; beyond reason, again, we admit. Observe the confusion between contrary & beyond: it is Hume's fallacy in his Essay on Miracles. We cannot apply where reason does not go. Analogies in Nature; three beams of light of diff. colors, make one white beam of light. body soul & spirit make man, &c.* This analogy no explanation or illustration of the Trinity; only of use on Bp Butler's principle & as meeting this objection

2 The doctrine cannot be comprehended and is therefore to be rejected. Carry out this principle & you come necessarily to Atheism.

(b) My purpose is not so much to adduce a detailed array of texts, as to indicate the lines of the argument and its logical connexions. Its several steps to be carefully noted.

I Intimations of some sort of a Plurality in the Godhead, in the Old Testament. Several subdivisions here.

* Sewell's Xtn Morals, p. 256

The Jews certainly believed in a trinity -

1. The plural form of Elohim: nothing in itself, but in connexion with other matters, of value.
2. Such passages, as Gen. I, 26: XI, 7. Same observation applies as above.
3. The manifestation of the angel Jehovah. #1
4. Expressions which attribute a personal character to the Word or Wisdom of God #2

II. 1. In the N.T. ~~three~~ three persons are mentioned in connexion with the Godhead in the form of Baptism, #3 and of Blessing #4

2. On examining into this phenomenon, we find that each of these is declared to be God.

a. The Father, confessedly so on all hands.

B. The Son; and here two heads of argument; (1a) Deduction and comparison of passages; (2a) Distinct declarations.

(1a) Compare various O.T. passages with others in N. Isaiah XL. 3, 'a with John I. 23; Zech. XII, 4, 10, with John XIX, 37; Is. VI. with John XII, 37 & 41. #5

'b The Son is worshipped as God; Heb. 1. 6. Rev. V. 8. 12. 13; Acts VII, 59.

'c Attributes of God, are attributed to Him; (1) Eternity; (2)

#1 Genesis XXXII; Hosea XII; Joshua V. Judges IX XIII.

#2 Prov. VIII. The Jewish theology & the considerations on this matter. Oxlee

#3 Matt XXVIII. 19. Bp. Horne's Trinity Sunday Sermon | On the Trinity, vol I.

#4 II Cor XIII. 14.

#5 Jones of Nayland is very full here.

אֵל גִּבּוֹר אֲבִי־עַד שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם

The Aramaic utterance of Adam in the garden was that alarmed the Elohim

Then pl. God is used times of them

Omniscience; (3) Omnipresence; (4) Self existence; (5) Im-
-mortality. #'

d. Powers of God are exercised by Him: (1) Lord of the Sabbath; (2) over angels; (3) forgives Sin; (4) judges the world; (5) creates all things; (6) preserves all things; (7) has all power in heaven & earth. #'

(2) (a)

(a) Isaiah IX.6; comp. Matt: IV.14; as also Is. VII & Matt. I.23
(b) The Λογος of John's Gospel
(c) The assumption of the name, I am; John VIII, 58.
(d) The confession of Thomas; John XX, 28.
(e) God blessed forever; Rom. IX. 5.
(f) The fulness of the Godhead; Col. ii.9
(g) God addresses him as God; Heb. I. 8.
(h) Equal with God without robbing: Phil. ii, 5-7.
(i) God manifest in the flesh; I Tim. iii, 16 (any reading)
(j) His blood is God's blood; Acts XX, 28.
(k) The true God; I John, V, 20.

C The Holy Ghost: Here also are two heads (1) Deduction and Comparison; (2) Distinct statements.

(1) – Attributes & powers of God ascribed to Him. (1) He works miracles. (2) inspires the Prophets; (3) by indwelling makes men temples of God; (4) All holiness referred to Him; (5) is omnipresent & omniscient; (6) is the Creator; (7)

#' [illegible] on [illegible] for proof texts –

is everlasting; (b) sin against Him is unpardonable.*'

(2) ~~I~~ (a) God of Israel; II Sam. xxiii, 2, 3. (b) God: Acts xxviii, 25. comp. with Isaiah vi, 9; I Cor iii, 16 compared with I Cor, vi, 19: Acts v, 3, comp. with 4. c. Jehovah; Exod. xxiv, comp. with II Cor. iii, 16, 17.

Here then we reach this wonderful phenomenon. The intimations of the Old Test. settle into the distinct statements of the New: deduction & comparison of passages lead us to the same conclusion & we find that the Father is God, the Son is God, & the Holy Ghost is God.

Now of these facts, Brown, there are ^logically 3 & only three possible explanations; either (1) there are all independent self existent Gods; or (2) the words Father, Son & Holy Ghost are merely names which are applied to one Divine Person, under varying conditions & circumstances; or (3) there is one divine Substance, & in that a Tripersonality. (1) is Tritheism; (2) is Sabellianism, (3) the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. Other schemes do not reconcile, they only deny one or more of the previous facts. The difficulty in (1) is in its neglect of the distinct statements that God is one; it neglects all this side of Script. statement, not reconciling but ignoring the assertion ~~that~~ there is one ~~&~~ only God. This is fatal to all claim on its part to support from the H.S.

---

*' Browne. Art. I.

The difficulty in Sabellianism, exactly the opposite. As Tritheism ignores the Unity of God, so this ignores the opposite phenomenon, of the personality of the Father, Son & Holy Ghost, & reduces the whole ~~thing~~ to a matter of nomenclature. But this will not do. The personal acts, characteristics, & agencies, are ascribed to ~~the~~ Father, Son, & Holy Ghost, which are entirely at variance with the idea that these words are names or indications of office.#1 Putting these theories thus to one side, there remains logically only the third, the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, which I proceed to justify.

I Observe the phenomena to be reconciled as H. S. brings them before us. (a) One God in Substance & Nature. (b) three persons, each God (c) each invested with personal attributes & agencies, Father, Son, & Holy Ghost.

II Each of these is asserted in H. S. to be one with the other two: the Father & the Son ~~are~~ One: the Father & the Spirit ~~are~~ one; the Son & the Spirit one: the same works being ascribed to each indifferently.#2

III The Father is never spoken of as begotten, or proceeding; but as uncreated.

IV The Son, is declared to be begotten of the Father, & that from all eternity an uncreated being.#3

V The Holy Spirit, is declared to ~~be begotten of~~ proceed from the Father

#1 Browne Art. I, Sec. II, Head IV. proves this out & out

#2 " " " " " Div. iii.

#3 Col. 1, 15

A Unitarian, Lamson, (Alvah L. D.D.) has written a book on 1st 3 cent. to prove. For early hymn see "Julia of Baiae"
(a) because no one denied it & this is the abominable evil of heresy & denial, circumscribing figure of speech. Bpbr.

[and the Son], & is also everlasting & uncreated.

Put the phenomena together, what do you get? (a) One substance of the Godhead; (b) in this one substance, a person, uncreated, unbegotten, not proceeding, the Father; (c) in the same substance, another person, uncreated, ~~unbegotten~~, not proceeding, but begotten, the Son; (d) another person, not created, not begotten, but proceeding, the Holy Ghost; that is, one substance, three Persons, the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity. [I shall enter more at length into the Procession, further on.] #1

(c) Testimony of the early Church. It has always been the object of at least some of those who deny the Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, to induce the belief that it was never heard of till the Council of Nice. Romanists have not unfrequently taken this same ground. The purposes different — former to disparage the doctrine: the latter, to gain support for the idea, that a Gen. Council can act for the new articles of Faith. #2 It is a question of fact; to be decided by a reference to the Ante-Nicene Fathers. #3 Cautions in studying the topic: (a) do not expect to find language as scientific & logical as later on; (b) nor the same terms; (c) nor elaborate arguments and proofs of the Doctrine; & all this, because

#1 Bull's Catholic Doct. of the Trinity.

#2 Case of Petavius; in Pref. to Bull's Defensio.

#3 Consult Bull's Def., wh. really exhausts the topic; & Cary's Testimonies of the A. N. Fathers.

No distinction of kinds of worships – (λατρεία, ὑπερδουλεία, & δουλεία, &c of Rome)

0' See extract in Note book, from Ignatius ad Eph. c. 2.

Answer to Arians was "who made us use new words"

Nice had to make a form which Arians could not assent.

the doctrine was not yet denied. Impossible to enter into details: I assert the fact that the Ante Nicene writers, do not prove the doctrine: I refer to themselves, & to Bull's elaborate treatise: & may challenge the world to deny the fact.

(d) Language of the Symbol & of Theology. Some preliminary considerations: (a) Objection is made, that words are employed wh. are not found in H.S.: this an objection made by Unitarians now; but it is as old as Arius, & was answered in various places, by Athanasius. An erroneous explanation of an old & simple word, compels it to be guarded by new and more scientific statement; & the true issue, besides, is not whether the word itself, but whether the idea which it contains, is in H.S. (b) another objection; these words do not explain the doctrine; in reply, they were not intended to do so: their object is to state, to defend, to preserve, & guard against ~~the~~ error. (c) a third objection: they add something to the Faith as already existing: in reply, they do not: they only state the Faith more definitely, giving in some cases explicit form to what was implicitly held; in other cases, guarding it from perversion.#

Classification of terms: the terms employed in the Symbol, and in Theology, may be thus arranged —

I Terms common to all three Persons. II Terms by=

Turretinus - Vol I p. 228; Edin. 1847.

But sometimes ὑπόστασις for essence

these terms (any in this subject) are not used & explain

pressing the relations of the several Persons to each other. III Terms peculiar to each Person. You can see at once, that the very fact, that we have proved the existence of three Persons in the substance of the Godhead, makes such terms necessary, & grounds them not on theory, but on fact. I do not propose to exhaust the terminology here; but only to notice the more important matters.

I Under this head are various words; note the following, Essence, Nature, Substance: Subsistence, Existence: Suppositum, Person. The 1st three are quite akin to each other: Essence derived from esse; Nature from nascor: Substance from substo; and they are all applied to the ~~individual~~ undivided Godhead, in wh. all the Persons share. Subsistence & Existence, stand related to Substance & Essence respectively. Subsistence is the mode in which substance, subsists entire & complete; Existence, is essence passed out of possibility into actual being; the idea of possibility of being, however, as distinguished from actuality belongs not to God. Suppositum & Person: differ in this that the former does not involve the idea of ~~the~~ rationality, & the latter does. They imply undivided existence or subsistence. The Greek call essence οὐσία, Nature φύσις: Person, ὑπόστασις.

II Note the following terms: Origin: Principium, Cause: Procession, Generation: Relation, Notion. Origin is the emanation or flowing forth, of one thing from

So as soon as the mind existed it had a thought.

So active & passive spiration

another, & it may be in time or from eternity; it may involve the separation of the thing originated from itself, or it may not. Principium & Cause, are used in connexion with the above statements. Prin. is generic, Cause, specific: Prin. generally is that from wh. anything proceeds; if the thing so proceeding passes outside of the Prin. then it becomes a cause.

Procession & generation; are likewise generic & specific: every generation is a procession, but not vice versa; Procession ~~[illegible]~~ divided in ad intra when the produced term remains within the Principium; ad extra, when the produced term passes outside the principium, which then becomes a cause; the former applies to the procession of the Son from the Father & the Holy Ghost from both, the latter to the creation of the universe. Relation & Notion; the first of these expresses the order or respect from Person to another, & the latter that by which we distinguish one Person from another.

III All the above are general terms: under this head we come to terms & those which are more specific.

1. The Father, is, not proceeding, unbegotten, αὐτόθεος. He begets the Son, he makes the Spirit proceed.

2 The Son, is, begotten, only begotten, begotten from all eternity — that is always existing, & always the Son by eternal generation — meeting the Paternity of the Father

"My Father is greater than I"

by his filiation consubstantial, ὁμοούσιος, with the Father, not αὐτόθεος, but θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ, & causing the Spirit to proceed.

That he is consubstantial we prove, when we prove him to be God; that He is not God of by himself is deduced from the fact that there is only one God: that this is not another name for the person of the Father, is proved by the instances of personal agency before Christ. That the generation is eternal, is proved by this having been begotten before time & creation.[1] That he causes the Spirit to proceed will be considered further on. The word Homoousion, the test word at Nice, it had been used previously; was objected to (a) as a new word, & (b) as having been condemned at a council in Antioch, AD 278. The Arians argued against it, also on abstract grounds. As to the 1st objection it is untrue: as to the 2d the Antiochene council condemned the use of the word where it was improperly used to signify the identity not of the nature, but of the person of the Son, with that of the Father but the word used properly it did not.[2]

The fact that the Son is Deus ex Deo, not Deus a se leads to what is called the subordination of the Son in the order of the Trinity.

#1 Col. I. 15. 17

#2 Cf. Kaye Counc. of Nice: Newman's Arians; Bull's Def. Sec. II. Cap. I.

So Tertullian & Pelagius

Didymus says from the Father — which cannot be without the Son — therefore from the Father & Son as a unit, or by the Son, being identical.

This don't affect its retention in the Litany or Articles & accompanying Service. But what they object to is the two apxai

Ought to be the Constantinopolitan Creed not Nicene

Pom. Visit. — 4 lessons

Hor. 23 – Iliad

Began March 7

#7 Horace

1 Satires

1 Livy

Algebra

[Tues] Sick

S. 24

S. 1 — Pom. Ind

[illegible] lessons

S. 7 — Iliad

— m – a

— T

— W

X S. 14

— m

— Tu

— Wed

Satires

X S. 21 — m – a

$30

$42

$72

36
2
72

Thursday sick

X Sun. 28 Monday — Tuesday

May 5 Wednesday — late [illegible]

24
21

X S May 5.

Art VIII

24 – 2 particulars

I. a. 25 – Prove ~~that He if a~~ [illegible]

6. 1. 26. Person – The form of Baptism

2. 27. The oppos. & evil spirits.

3. 28. The personal attrib. given Him.

c. 29 These make him [illegible] the [illegible] S. (John XIV. 26 XVI. 13. 8)

d. 30 4 proofs ~~that~~ He is God.

e. 31 Wh. person

f. 32 Procession XV. 26 Gal. IV. 6

II — 33 Gives the 6 offices of the H. Gh.

— Eph. 1. 14

6. 5 X – 1 Cor XII. 8. 11 – καθὼς βούλεται. Παρακ.

d – 1 Cor III. 17 – ναὸς θεοῦ – τὸ πνεῦμα οἰκεῖ

c – John XV. 17 – πέμψω αὐτόν

d, c Eph. 1. Voltaire 2. Haven Power — 1. [illegible] unpardonable infidelity [illegible] — 2. Point there are sins of ignorance & unforgiveness wh. may be continued neither — maybe much [illegible]

Matt XII. 31. 32 – ~~Which there is sin against~~ ~~Lord of that Spirit~~ – to God

1. Revelation — Anointing — Blasphemy

2. Regeneration — Temple — Rebuke [illegible]

Attestation — Xt Conception

3 { Intercessor — Spiritual conjunction — Earnest

Ἐκπορεύω – Eternal procession

Ἐκπέμπω – Mission

4 { Ministry of reconciliation

3 The Holy Ghost, from all eternity, proceeds from the Father & the Son. This opens the whole vexed question as to the Procession & between East & West. Of course (a) that the question is twofold (1) of Doctrine, whether the Holy Ghost does proceed from the Father & the Son; & (2) of the historical right of inserting the words Filioque in the Creed.

(1) In order to understand, notice the distinction between Mission & Procession; the former, signifying His being sent in time, after the Ascension as the Comforter & the Paraclete; the latter referring to His eternal existence as the 3rd Person in the Adorable Trinity. The 1st expressed in the G. by πέμπειν, the second by ἐκπορεύεσθαι. From this the Mission depends on the Procession: that is, the former & right to send, are grounded in the procession of the Spirit from the Sender; & hence, inasmuch as the Son constantly sends #1 as well as the Father, we conclude that the Holy Ghost proceeds from Him also. The probability is that there is really only a difference of words on the part of the Greeks. #2 As to the historical question; the words from the Son

#1 John XV. 26. XVI, 7.

#2 Browne Art. V; Laud ag. Fisher p. 9. Oxf. 1839: Forbes, vol I, p. 271–; for the views of the early Ch. see Pearson's valuable notes on Art VIII; & there he is on Procession.

A topic of Whitsunday of great importance is the personality of the Holy Spirit.

(undervaluing of means, undervalues ends)

The Holy Ghost is in place of Xst & is now the worker as was in the Fathers, then the Xst & then the Holy Spirit. "Πνευμα και νυμφη" Rev XXI

here not in the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Symbol. If the Creeds will allow us to add them we certainly need not compel them to do so. #1

Observe that I have not here been dealing with the Divine Names & attributes which Scripture applies to the Godhead, or its three Persons; but only with the terminology of theology: intended to set forth, what is revealed in a [illegible] by Scripture

(e) Errors Ancient & Modern.

In developing the foregoing statements, three principal topics have come before us: (1) the Unity of the Essence, & the distinction of the Persons; (2) the relations of the Persons as consubstantial, coequal, coeternal; (3) the eternal generation of the Son, & Procession of the Holy Ghost. The errors correspond exactly to these divisions & topics. ~~[illegible]~~ Tritheists destroy the Unity of the Godhead. Sabellians deny the distinction of Persons. Arians deny the consubstantiality, coequality, & coeternity of the Son. Macedonians that of the Holy Ghost. Arians again the eternal generation of the Son: Macedonians the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost. Modern Socinians, ingeniously combine all these denials, in one grand class-form of error. The History of these Heresies belongs elsewhere. #2

#1 In gen. Hist. see Hardwicke's Med. Ages. by Index: conf. Mosheim & Gieseler. Owens Introd. Dog. Theol. 169 p.

#2 Besides the reference already given in passing the following

are very important. Athanasius, contra Arian. Orat IV.
De Decretis Synodi Nicaenae; De Incarn. Christi.
Augustin, De Trinitate, Libri xv. Waterland's Works
on the Trinity. Bp. Horsley's writings against Priestley.
Faber's Apostolicity of Trinitarianism. Heber's Bampton
Lectures. Pearson on the creed.

A
Angels

Topic II Works of Nature

I. Existence of Angels; II. Nature; III Fall of a part of them; IV Offices of good Angels & Men; V Rel. of evil Angels & men; VI Worship of Angels.

I An a priori prob. of the existence of Angels fr. the fact of gradations in God's works; connecting links to be found: this would lead us to expect something intermediate betw. God & man.

Holy Scr. confirms this. Two heads of proof; (1) passages wh. directly assert their existence. We need give no refs. A concordance will furnish them

Obj. — to be considered

1 Moses does not relate their creation. Ans. Prove that they are not included in the words "heaven & earth";# or even if th. were proved, the mere omission to narrate their creation, when their existence is so continually asserted & implied, might, if there were no assertion of their creation, make for their eternity but not against their existence.

2 Strauss (Leb. Jes.) obj. that their existence as well as the names of any of them were unknown till after the Babylonish Captivity. Their names were told to Dan. their ex. asserted by bef.

Incl. in Heav. & Earth. (Aug. de Civ. D. XI. 9, 32-34)

3. It is the name of an office: that does not prove that there is no being who holds the office: it rather presupposes one, & is no proof against an asserted existence.

4. The archangel Michael is only another name for Xt. Grant it, for argument's sake; & does that prove no others? But cf. Dan 10 & Rev. 12.

The question as to the time of their creation may be considered here: not a practical one; two opinions: (1) that they were created before this visible world; (2) contemporaneously with it. The Lord's own words in Job. 38. 7 certainly looks towards the former opinion #1: the Gr. fathers favored it. Moderns incline to the latter.

II #2 On the Nature of Angels we can say little more than that they are spirits. Question raised among theologians as to their having a body. Some assert a subtle body, others make them pure Spirits. Not worth noticing, exc. as connected with interpretations of H. S.

(a) Bodies are argued fr. Gen. 6, 2, 4, interpreted as implying sexual intercourse of angels & human beings. * Sons of God means children of Seth.

(b) Matt 22. 30 is regarded as intimating

#2 Heb. 1. 7

#1 Bp. Bull: Serm 11 & 12: Heber Serm in Eng. 2, 3, 4. Field c. 1-3. Hook. I. 4

an angelic
body like our spiritual one: that is missing the point of the comparison, which lies in respect of freedom fr. earthly relations.
(c) Bodily attributes are given them: this may be only figuratively, as they are also to God. But of course aside fr. inerrancy H.S. expos. any one has a right to either opinion. Two points properly fall in here: (1) Angelic Appearances; (2) Orders & ranks among them.
(1) Constantly asserted & apparently in 3 modes: (a) in dreams#; (b) in ecstatic visions, as to the Prophets & S. John in the Apocalypse; (c) in visible forms, as frequently to the Patriarchs & others. If this last is regarded as an argument for a body, so be it.
(2) A priori, orders & gradations probable, fr. the fact that they are found in all created beings, among men on earth & saints in heaven. They are more prob. from the various words used in H.S. as an angelic nomenclature: e.g. Cherubim, Seraphim, Thrones, Virtues, Dominions, Powers, Principalities, Archangels, Angels. We know no more. This question curiously connected with Ch. govt.(!!) according as ranks among angels are asserted or denied, approved of gradation orders in the ministry on earth are said

Gen. 28. 12; Matt. 1. 20. Acts 27. 23.

the Schoolmen had all arranged & settled in order & precedence. All this, pr. a work of the 5th or late in the 4th cent, called the Celestial Hierarchy, falsely attributed to Dionysius the Areop.

III [#1] Fall of a part of the Angelic Host. the fact distinctly asserted in H.S. Of the time wh. elapsed between creation & fall, nothing is told us; & on the cause H.S. is equally silent. To us therefore there is of necessity a twofold division: i.e. Good & Evil Angels. #2

IV Offices of Good – H.S clearly shows. Ministering Spirits. Ministers of God, who stand before Him & minister to him, & they fulfill His commands & do His pleasure #3

If it is asked why they are employed, we answer, because of God's good pleasure, just as any second causes, instruments or agents are employed in His providential administrations. H.S describes ministry of them as fourfold: (1) to God; (2) to each other; (3) to the visible creation; (4) to man.

(1) (a) worship (b) obedience. The wings in Isaiah are emblems of reverence & readiness. #4 To the Second Person a special relation. #1 – see next page

---

#4 Is. vi. 2, 3; Rev. iv. 8, & vii. 11, 12; Lu. ii. 13. 14; Ps. ciii. 2; Dan. vii. 10;

#3 Heb. 1. 14; Ps. civ. 4. Dan vii. 10; Lu. 1. 19, Ps. ciii. 20, 21. — see next p.

#2 Hooker Bk. 1, c. 4. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei. xii. c. 6. Cudworth;

#1 2 Pet. ii. 4 – Jude 6. [Trench on 1 Joh. iii. 3, 4.

#5 Luke 22.43. Matt. 28. 2.3. Acts 1.10 Luke 1, 31. 2, 3.
Heb. 1.6 Matt. 4, 11. 25, 31.

(2) – ministers
      worship #1

(3) Details impossible. Gen xxviii, 12. Ps civ. & various places in the Apocalypse show that they are ministers of Providence.

(4) (a) To the wicked. (b) To the Holy. Inflict God's judgments as on the Egyptians, the army of Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, Herod: & they are evidently concerned in the transactions of the judgment. #2 (b) (1) teach them as agents communicating supernaturally God's will #3 (2) they console them as in cases of Hagar, Jacob, Daniel, Elias, Mary, the Apostles, (3) they encamp around the just. (4) they protect them, deliver them fr. danger as in the cases of Lot, Elisha, 3 Holy Children Daniel, Peter. (5) minister to the dying & bear some relation to children. #4 Many argue a guardian angel from this verse for each person. It certainly cannot be proved, but if there be no worship rendered it may be held as an opinion. So among Jews & Fathers.

V Permitted to tempt & try & ruin souls of men. #5 Question of demoniacs. In Matt. iv. 24 dem. & lun. are distinguished.

VI i. Evidence of H.S. & ii. of early Ch. i. no command in O.T. commands the other way. Rom. allege Gen. xlviii. 2; but 1st same words is used in xxxiii. 13 & not necessarily

#5 Eph. vi. 11, 12, 13. I Peter v. 8. 9. Hebrews Demons in hy r.
#4 Matt. xviii. 10 [Bp. of Maine's charge [5-9]]
#3 Luke i. 11. Matt xxviii. Acts x.
#1 Is. vi. 3 #2 Matt xiii. 41. 49 xxv. 3

means worship & applying the rule that possibles must be explained by certains it cannot. Besides one of the angels may be Jehovah. In the case of Joshua v. 14, 15. & Gen xxviii: 13 (cf. xxxi. 11) is also alleged.

(6) In N. T. in Col ii: 18 (the only didactic statement) St. P. condemns the worship of angels. Acts x. 25-26. Rev. xix. 10. xxii: 9 Matt. iv. 9. 10 are in point.# the latter presenting the only instance of worshipping being claimed. The Romish distinction of Latria, dulia, & hyperdulia is of no use even if admissible. For if St John knew about it, angel must have refused Dulia, unless St John was ignorant for the time being.

II Evidence of early Ch. (a) negative no assertion of worship for 3 centuries a must. (b) Positive; assertions made incompatible with it. (c) confirmatory of both. No forms of invocation extant in private writings or liturgies. In the apostolic Fathers not a passage can be found that even looks toward it. In the 1st apology of Justin Martyr is a passage on it. Bellarmine & Newman on development both count for the worship of angels ## the difficulty has arisen from a false construction of the passage — ἐκεῖνον τόν τε παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ... being the objects of σεβόμεθα & προσκυνοῦμεν while ... & πνεῦμα ... are the objects of ... [Winer's Gr. Gram. § 321. 1. a.] this is perfectly possible grammatically

Bp. Kaye's Just. Mart. p 54, note.

Townsend's Harmony, note.

a: invoking ~~using~~ as we do the Maker of the Universe & him ~~that~~ taught us these things. by Irenaeus.

"Nor does Ch. do anything by invocation of angels"
Irenaeus.

& is made certain by his statement in the 2d Apol. in refuting the charge of Atheism[a]; that Xtians worship 1st the Father, the Creator, 2d the Son 3d the Holy Ghost.[#] A passage is also ~~is~~ alleged from Origens Homily on ~~the~~ 1st verse in Ezekiel. In it angels are spoken of largely. It is said "all things are full of Angels". "Come Angel, take up one who by the Word is converted from former error --- cherish him & instruct him". Now as to this passage we have to say (1) that there is very much grave doubt, as to the genuineness of the § where it occurs. (2) ~~that~~ the whole passage is incoherent & impassioned & (3) ~~that the~~ ~~intercession~~ introduction of an apostrophe in a passage is small warrant for a doctrine. #2

These so far as I know are the only important passages alleged, the testimony of all the early Fathers these places excepted is against the doctrine in toto. You will find their testimony fully given by Mr Taylor as above. Invocation of Saints will come up later on.

II.B. — body & Spirit united. (1) Man in Creation before the Fall. (2) The Effect of the Fall (3) Man after the Fall, wh leads to Doctrine of Original Sin.

(1) To avoid those curious questions of exegesis. are so numerous in connection with this portion

---

#2 Taylors Xtian Worsh. part 1. c. ix. §6

#1 By Mayor. supp. Palmers letter to Wisemans letter v. p 22. Also Taylors former Xtian Worship. p. 106

of H.S. the only safe mode of enquiring — as follows. (a) to take what the Mosaic narrative plainly asserts. (b) consider what light other parts of H.S. throw upon it. (c) inasmuch as the work of Jesus X. for us is called a restoration, a new creation, to reason back in the way of analogy, fr. the ideal of that restoration to what we were before the restoration became needful, i.e. before the Fall. Nowhere is mere speculation to be more deprecated than here. (1) the narrative asserts two parts to man, a natural body & a living soul. (2) Continuous life is promised to both on condition of obedience, inasmuch as the penalty denounced against disobedience is death. (3) the whole moral condition of the creature is expressed in the phrase "Image of God". In developing these two last named methods go hand in hand together: As to the soul its immortality in virtue of its creation as a spiritual substance is implied in the epithet living (Gen. ii:7), the same immortality a doctrine almost of Nat. Religion, is presupposed in Scripture & scarcely so much dogmatically asserted as taken for granted. Still it is asserted.#' In this case then the penalty of death cannot be understood in the same sense as in the death of the body when it involves a dissolution & cessation of existence. It must be the

#' Eccl. xii. 7. Mat. x. 28. Luk. xxiii. 43. Rev. vi. 10: Phil. i. 23

the tree of Life the first Sacrament of Paradise,

death of sin & the punishment consequent on sin. As to the body it being formed of matter & c. is in its nature corruptible, its immortality could not have been an inherent characteristic. St Pauls argument in I Cor. xv. makes this clearer, his argument involving an antithesis between the resurrection body & the original body of unfallen Adam: this immortality then was a special gift & it seems to have been conveyed by the tree of life. In this case the penalty of death involved corruption & possible destruction at least of mod subsistentiam.

The great difficulty lies in the words Image of God. We are of course justified in referring it to the moral nature & in order to develope its meaning, in employing the analogy alluded to above. Now the results of Xs work of salvation as we gather from the N. T. are as follows. (1) the gift of the Holy Spirit (2) Remission of sin, delivering us from the punishment on repentance. (3) deliverance fr. the power of sin in our gradual sanctification. (4) conformity of our spiritual nature & specially of its guiding principle the will, to God & holiness. (5) the balance & regulation of powers & passions. (6) the subjection of the animal & carnal to the spiritual (7) the resurrection of the body (8) Eternal happiness to body & soul. All these uniting

on the merits of the sacrifice of Xt. It is a fair analogy to reason now from man restored to man unfallen, only ~~not~~ reversing the order of statement. We then obtain for man before the Fall, combining former conclusions. (1) Life & happiness to soul & body. (2) Life inherent in the soul, a gift to the body. (3) The animal under the dominion of the spiritual without contest. (4) Powers & Passions balanced. (5) The will conformed with the will of God & free. (6) Freedom fr. power of sin in holiness. (7) Freedom from punishment of sin in obedience. (8) The crowning presence of the Holy Ghost. The parallel full and complete with just those differences between an original state & a restoration that ought to have been anticipated. Divines pretty much at one on these points except the last one. The Jewish church held something of this kind.* The early fathers also reassert it. Later Protestant writers frightened from it by a false association with Popery. We may expect fr. all testimony & authority argue (1) on grounds of analogy as above. (2) from Adams communion with God. (3) from indications of superhuman knowledge. The 1st 7 enumerated ~~gifts~~ may be called the Images of Nature; the 8th the Images of Grace.

*? Bp. Jolly on Baptismal Regeneration. Bp. Bull. Man before Fall.
*'' Owen on the Spirit. Vol. iii: c. 3?.

Objected that 1st command was too simple – but this was more merciful – then the way of death was narrow & the way of life was broad.

Calvinist says man per se is sinful, so people struggling out of Calvinism they write as if they were Pelagianist but merely mean that H. G. works on such powers as man already has, & does not have a [illegible]

& if we may believe that Adam continuing would have passed painlessly into a higher state that would have been the Image of God.

II Man originally placed on[+] probation & to all intents & purposes in a covenant. Condition obedience to a given Law: Law forbidding to do a certain act: this comes possible to a free agent; obedience & disobedience; covenant broken; probation lost by effect of an external temptation acting on the free will; & so blessings forfeited, & doom denounced incurred. The penalty Death: physical to the body; spiritual to the soul. Chaos of powers & passions ensued. Holy Spirit withdrawn. General statements, to be drawn out more fully in the next head.

"III (Original Sin) Condition to which man was plunged by the Fall; then he lost (1) the gift of the H. G. (2) the innocence & uprightness of his nature (3) became ~~liable~~ liable to physical death in the body & spiritual death in the soul.

All this occurred & it is ~~s~~ summed up in the expression loss of the Image of God — before Adam begat any descendants. When he did he begat them in his own fallen image,[#1] that is with a nature depraved & corrupted.[#2] Several points here on the gen. question. 1. Is this natural condition of Adams descendants morally an

#1 Gen. V:3. #2 Rom. V:12 & seq.

imputation of his sin to us, wh. leaves our moral nature as it was, & simply forensic in its character; or is it transmission of an infected nature? The only noticeable place where sin is spoken of as imputed is in Rom. v. 13 & there it is a personal imputation of a personal act. On the other hand, H. S. does represent us placed in the position of sinners by the sin of Adam, #1 & it does also assert that our nature is infected with evil & powerless. #2 These two positions show that original sin is the infected nature wh. we inherit fr. Adam, our natural Federal Head. (2) But it is objected that this makes God unjust, allowing children to suffer for their fathers sin. Apply Bp. Butler's principle; reason fr. analogy of God's ordinary government in the world: hereditary traits, insanity, diseases are cases in point: the dilemma follows, either God is not the author of Nature, or else this is no real difficulty. (3) This it may be said compels all men to sin by necessitate. But we do not say that a man will commit overt transgressions, but that without God's help he can never overcome the concupiscentia. Besides this objection could only lie in case God left man to himself wh. he does not.

We come now to descend to details.

#2 Job. xiv. 4. xv. 14. Ps. 51. 5 John iii. 6 Rom. viii. 3, 7, 8 vii. 18 Eph. ii. 3

#1 Rom. v. 18. 19

as far as possible –

Eph. V. 26.27

Art. IX. (a) We say that original sin is more than the following of Adam. This was Pelagianism.*[1] Passages above prove a corrupt nature. (b) The Intention is each individual. Principal cont. between Calvinists ~~Arminians~~ Remonstrants, &c. Our article very strongly worded. Orig. very far gone." Lat. "Quam longissime". Script. very strong. Rom VII:18. As far gone I should say as we can be & have any possible point of contact for the Holy. A negative, not a positive state. (c) The Extension as to the race. Universal. Xt only excepted. *[2] At this point we must pause to consider the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (a) H.S. arguments. It is distinctly stated that all are included under sin.*[3] Unless therefore there is a specific exception of Mary she is also. Passages alleged to prove that exception (1) "She shall bruise thy head." Ipsa conteret Gen III:16 rests on a false translation of the Vulgate's & proves nothing at any rate. (2) "Thou art all fair my love there is no spot in thee." Cant. IV.7. The Ch. not Mary is here the subject. (3) "Hail thou that art full of grace" Vulgate. Eng. has "highly favored." Greek is κεχαριτωμένη. Full of grace is the stronger

---

*3 Rom V. 1 Cor XV

*2 1 Cor. XV. 22. Rom V. 12 II Cor V. 21. Heb IV. 15

*1 John III: 6. I Cor. XV:22 Rom. V. 12

Mr. Newman says that Eve was type of Mary & to carry out type M. must also be immaculate.

So Greek Ch. "Voices from the East"

expression. πληρης χαριτος: & this is not applied to Mary but it is to Stephen #1 or if that reading is incorrect then only to Xst. #2 No exc. therefore holds. Lambruschini argues in this way: No virgin ever bore a son except Mary: so she was an exc. to one general law: therefore she may be to this one also. But may be does not prove is: & one exc. distinctly stated is rather different from one not stated at all. Others argue for the necessity of the Dogma, on the ground that "a clean thing cannot come from an unclean" #3 & that Mary must have been free from original sin or Xt would not. But a fortiori of Mary then Mary's mother & so on till you reach our first parents where original sin vanishes. As to testimony the only authority down to the year 1440 of any weight is in a passage from St. Aug. Nothing is alleged for 200 years & nothing apparently to the purpose till St. Aug. That only is apparent. All he says is, & it is given as a private opinion that in treating of sin he will say nothing of the virgin "because grace was given her he thinks to overcome sin entirely". Would she have needed grace if she had no sin from nature. St Aug. then is no witness. Proclus' diagram in the Council of Ephesus (431) is nothing to the purpose they had not in view not the virgin. Testimony fails. In 831 Paschasius Radbertus faintly wanted it.

#1 Acts vii. 8 #2 John I. 14 #3 Job. xiv. 4

Not even a Synod in 1854, merely asking advice of his clergy whether the time had come!

My Romanism is a new religion

Epiphanius whom they quote condemned the Collyridians for a sort of [illegible] worship of Queen of Heaven

Now — she is Coredemptress & in the [illegible] & commands as a Queen.

In 1140 St Bernard condemned the institution of the festival at Lyons: & with it the doctrine. Thomas Aq. denies the whole thing. Duns Scotus proposed it in 1306 as a novelty. Sixtus IV. in 1483 in a Bull left the matter open still. Trent dodged the qu. still leaving it open. Paul V in 1617 forbade disputes. Gregory XV. in 1622 left the question still open; forbade the assertion that Mary was not conceived in original sin to be attacked & forbade any one to say she was so conceived, unless by permission of the Holy See. Alex VII in 1671 declared that the doctrine was not to be gainsayed, but that no one was to be called heretical for not holding it, & Pius IX Dec 8. 1854 in the Bull, Ineffabilis decreed the Immac. Conception as a part of the Catholic Faith under pain of damnation. The doctrine is only to be justified then on the plea of Development. Of Romanish [illegible] explanations of the Doct. 1. The Virgin merited this on account of her foreseen holiness. namely because of that sh. merited for this gift. Queer merit. 2. She deserved it because of her holiness in a preexistent state. ~~[illegible]~~ Prove the state first. Liability to punishment attaching to Orig. Sin. Great caution needed. Our article asserts this liability of the sin itself, but says nothing about the person in whom the sin it exists: & it deserveth &c. It may remove

* On the Popish side see Lambruschini's treatise N.Y. 1855. For the answer Abbé Laborde on the Impossibility &c. Phil. 1855.

the difficulty if we notice the distinctions between abstracts & concretes: between things stated simpliciter or naturally & things stated secundum quid or with circumstances annexed. Thus without the intervention of our Lord no man could have been saved. This intervention embraces infants as well as adults; in the case of adults condemnation might possibly be regarded as resulting from actual transgressions: in infants it could only apply to their corrupt nature: hence if infants are either redeemed or saved, it must be from the punishment attaching without Xt's intervention to Orig. Sin: whence Orig. Sin deserves God's wrath. The only escape is to say that Xt's redemption does not embrace infants & so they are saved without it or else that they are all lost. But observe this is stating a thing abstractly & simpliciter. Xt did intervene & his intervention affects every human being: so the abstract becomes the concrete: the simpliciter is changed to the secundum quid: & while a solemn truth is asserted an ideal & not a real state of concrete humanity is presented.

2 To cover the whole ground I mention here the relation of Orig. Sin to Baptism, but I reserve it till we come to that Sacrament. Ground error Pelagianism. Precedent to it Gnosticism Marcion, Manes. Nigra Vael

speculated in a way that interfered with true doctrine. You should also note the speculations of the School men, & the controversy of the Calvinists & Remonstrants.#1

"IV Works of Grace

1 Preliminary considerations. We have reached the point where, in consequence of the Fall, Grace & Nature came in contact. The agent in accomplishing this in the 1st place — Our Blessed Lord. Him therefore & His immediate work we are now to consider. Some general considerations, even at the risk of anticipating.

1 Our Lord the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world - Rev. xiii. 8 - that is His sacrifice had a retroactive efficacy reaching back from its actual offering as well as a prospective efficacy reaching forward to the same point.

2 In bringing in the mystery of Redemption to its actual exhibition in the world, & then carrying on its workings to their final issues, there have been three dispensations, the Patriarchal, the Jewish & the Xian.

3 The Patriarchal began in the promise of the Seed #2 & from the nature of the case included a initial & unclear

#1 Browne, Beveridge & Burnet Art IX. Heylin's Quinquarticular Cont. App. Laurence Bampton Lect. iii & iv. Bull ac exp. Wall's Baptism. Cary's Test. for his yearly Ch.

#2 Gen iii. 15 -

grow – naturally; but it must be by grace & hence covenant.
Calvinism st denied it.

superseded includes all mankind.
4 The Jewish dispensation was peculiar, limited, & specific. If as St Paul argues Gal. iii.17 the Law could not annul the Abrahamic covenant, so neither a priori could it annul the original promise in Paradise. Every human being was still under a covenant with God, except that a descendant of any of the 12 sons of Jacob refusing to enter the Jewish covenant was out of all covenant. For in his case the former covenant was superseded, & so it was the superseding covenant or none at all.
5 The Xtian Covenant returns to that universality wh the Patriarchal had, at least in the divine intention. The Jewish covenant wh. was only a temporal & typical provision is done away entirely, the Patriarchal is superseded wherever the Xtian comes. Wherever in God's Providence it does not come the Patriarchal holds. So that again no man is out of all covenant with God, except one who when the Xtian is offered to him knowingly & willfully rejects it.
6 This throws light on the state of the heathen, explains such passages as John I. 9 & Rom ii. 14-15 & was recognized in the early Church.*
7 All along in these dispensations there is a Heavenly Intercessor & intercession & an earthly Priesthood & Rites.
8 Under the 1st. disp. there was some light & some

* Just. Mart. 1st Apol. the Paedagogus of Clemens Alex. c. vii. lib. i.

Always the duty is to keep what is given & not to try to develope into anything new, unless God orders it. Xtn [illegible] admits adjustment to different countries & manners. The 3 fold ministry & solidarity of Episcopate is all that is needfully preserved of the outer forms.
S.P. kept the faith & St. James

Unitarians used to reject these ch. & in an edition of theirs marked dub.
Evidence of A wh. leaves out the – & text of Epiphanius that in Ebionite gospel they were omitted, & the Ebionites ~~[illegible]~~ denies the incarnation!

spiritual strength: without Jesus' faith there could have been neither; under the 2d an increase of light but not of strength, sin made more fully known in the revelation of the Law. (Rom. vii. 7) but no strength to meet the stern requirement. (Rom viii. 3) Under the 3d full light & knowledge.

Compare the Decalogue & our Lord's Sermon on the Mount & the Holy Ghost shed on us abundantly. Tit. iii. 6

9 These give us the result of positive development made by God Himself. #

A The Incarnation 1. Inc. as a fact. II. the result of the Inc., with the Nature, as a Person being Incarnate. III. The result as to the object in Man: (1) in the Passion, making the incarnate person, a sacrifice of atonement for (a) original guilt, and (b) actual transgression & (2) in the Resurrection & ascension making the incarnate Person, the Second Adam, Mediatorial King, & spiritual Head of the redeemed.

I The fact asserted historically in Matt. 1, & Luke I & II. Only proved assumed as against the critical objections of Unitarians who feel the pressure against them of the narrative: constantly referred to in the epistles: & we shall note in advancing.

II. Definition. The Incarn. is the union of the person of the Son, the Logos, the Second Person in the adorable Trinity, with a human nature.

Rather on Presuppositions. The Creator. Theory

So St John, Λογος εγενετο σαρξ; not God became man: but the Word became man. (John 1.14). On the one side, then, St John asserts Divinity as pertaining to the Λογος, (I.1) and, as here Humanity: the general run of H.S. statement, may be taken here into the account, as confirming this. #3

2. The terms of the union must be the Person of the Word on the one hand, & the Human Nature on the other. For, if the Div. Nat., per se as it is in itself was united to this Human Nature, all the Persons of the Trinity would become Incarnate. The Human Nature consists necessarily of a body & a soul. The terms in Union then are: (1) the Divine Nature in the Person of the Λογος. (supra) & (2) a Human body & soul. #4

3. It also follows that there are two unions: (1) of the Div. Nat. in the Person of the Λογος & the Human Nature; (2) of the Soul & the Body in the Human Nature. In language of theology the 1st is hypostatical, the second state.

4. The conditions of the union: a. Not a Divine & Human Person were united, so making two persons. The Λογος himself a person, took a human nature into His personality. It is never said that the Λογος became a united himself to, or took upon him a man; but he became σαρξ

#3 Luke II. 52: Luke IV. 2: Matt XIV. 34. John 1.14

#4 Phil. II. 5. 6. 7: Heb. II. 16

Humanity in its most rudimentary form ~~in~~ in the virgin was united with

Hooker Xt by 3 degrees a receiver. 1st in that he is Son of God; 2d in that his human nature hath had the honour of union with Deity bestowed upon it; 3d, in that by means thereof sundry eminent graces have flowed as effects from Deity to that nature which is ~~and~~ coupled with it

There can be no greater grace showed towards man, than that God should vouchsafe to unite into man's nature the person of His only begotten Son.

The Deity of Xt hath enabled that nature which it took of man, to do more than man in this world hath power to comprehend. The soul of Xt that saw in this life the face of God was here, through so visible presence of Deity, filled with all manner of graces & virtues in that unmatchable degree of perfection, for which of him we read it written "That God with the oil of gladness anointed him above his fellows."

Cor XV - Son be subject, &c intimate a giving up of the kingdom, but 1st he has a kingdom as God the Creator but 2d he has a kingdom wh. he won by his obedience, & to God's exalting Him & giving Him a name. The mediatorial & economical part is to be given up; so there are two kingdoms & of the 2d are the mediatorial & ~~the~~ fruition, the 2d given up but just still reigning among the saints he has redeemed.

was made in the likeness ανθρώπων· [Phil. II. 7] took upon Him σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ: [Heb. ii. 16. and 17]. carefully following this, the Nicene Creed reads, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, (accusative) and the Latin translates "homo factus est" & we "was made man" not a man. There is, then, one Person only in Xt, that of the Logos —

6. The Divine & Human Natures, remain (1) united, (2) not either one absorbing the other, (3) not mixed into a tertium quid, & (4) never to be divided from each other, (1) the union is already proved. (2) the Human Nature cannot absorb the Divine for then Xt would cease, in the proper sense of the term to be the Son of God; nor can the Divine absorb the Human, for then He would cease to be the Son of Man. In either case, all the conditions on wh. St Paul argues to the Hebrews would be destroyed. (3) they cannot be mixed up into a third something, for then Xt would be neither God nor Man nor any other conceivable thing (4) they cannot ever be separated for then a new person would be formed the Human Nature must perish, & H.S. is express.‡ From this it follows that what was severed at the death of Xt, was the vital union of soul & body.

5 The Communicatio idiomatum, or when speaking of the whole Xt, by the concrete names God or Man, or more commonly Son of God or

‡ Heb. vi. 20; vii. 24, 24, 25; 28; Luke 1. 33; Rev. xi. 15 —

No abolishment, transition, infusion. Some things he does as God, some as Man, some as both.
Coöperation often, association always, never confused as to properties

Hooker — Because this Divine mystery is more ~~plain~~ true than plain, divines having framed the same to their own conceits & fancies are found in their exposition thereof more plain than true.
The Word was made flesh & dwelt in us
"Ἡ λογοθεῖσα φύσις οἱ ποιητῆρες τῆς κτίσεως" Theod
Xt is a person both divine & human, howbeit not therefore two persons in one; neither both these in one sense, but a person divine, because he is personally the Son of God; human, because he hath really the nature of the children of men.
"The infinite worth of the Son of God"
Some things he doth as God, because his deity alone is the well spring from which they flow; some things as man, because they issue from his mere human nature; some things jointly as both God & man, because both natures concur as principles thereunto.
A kind of mutual commutation there is, whereby those concrete names, God & Man, when we speak of Xt, do take interchangeably one another's room, so that, for truth of speech, it skilleth not whether we say, that the Son of God hath created the world, & the Son of Man saved—or vice versa.

See preceding pages.

man, we attribute to God the works of the manhood, & vice versa. #1

6 It follows as a necessary consequence from the above positions, that there are in Xt two intellects & two wills — (Luke II.52) (Matt. XXVI.39) to deny this makes one or the other nature.

7 The Errors may be numbered as four;

1. Arianism; denied the Divinity; met by Nice 325, & the word ἀληθῶς; also note ὁμοούσιος.

2. Apollinarianism; denied the ^external Human Soul, & put the Div. Nat. in its place; met by Const. I, 381, & the word τελέως.

3. Nestorianism; divided the Person; met by Ephesus 431 & the word ἀδιαιρέτως — also θεοτόκος.

4. Eutychianism; confounded the Natures; met by Chalcedon, 451, & the word ἀσυγχύτως.

Monotheletism, denying two wills, an offshoot of this, condemned at Const. III, 680.

Hooker thinks this covers the entire ground.

III The result of the incarnation, quoad its object, i.e. Man. Some preliminary considerations seem necessary;

1. The sequence & order to be ~~...~~ carefully considered; & this only to be understood by going back further still.

2. The grand underlying purpose of God to reconcile man to Himself, by relieving man from the evil into

#1 Hooker Lib. V. §§ LI–LIV: Pearson Art IV n 3; Browne p. 67–72

without (b) he is a licensed sinner
without (a) he is condemned for innocence

In the versicles in morning prayer after the creed
give ~~these~~ two

Whether God could have [illegible]
is not to be asked but stated ~~that we~~ cannot.

Note whole life a unit.

Before a dead sermon on the theory does what

3. That evil, twofold; (a) condemnation because of sin; (6) the power of sin holding him in the practice of it.

4 The want therefore, & so too the relief twofold; (a) Forgiveness of sin, remitting condemnation; (6) Sanctification by the Spirit, delivering from trans.

5 This work God had appointed to be done by a Mediator, who should unite the two natures of the parties to be reconciled, [Ep. to Heb.] & should obtain remission of sin for man, & the sanctification of the Spirit.

6. From these facts we get at last, the true sequence

a. The Incarnation & Nativity — furnish the Mediator, God & Man in one Pst.

b. The Passion & Death, reconcile the parties, God & Man, & make forgiveness & sanctification possible.

c. In the Resurrection & Ascension, the Incarnate God, the Mediator, the Head of the Ch, the Sovereign of the Kingdom, assumes the regal power, forgives sin, & justifies man, on the conditions of faith & repentance, & gives the Holy Spirit to sanctify, on the same conditions, together with obedience to the Laws & Institutions of God.

Observe the progress in supposing it unimpeded all thro': (1) Man is reconciled to God, & God to man, in & by the Passion. (2) Man is justified, by the Kingdom

Pantheistic or Materialistic, [illegible] in us by union with each man, or medievalistic in transubstantiation.

admission to His kingdom, & the conditions of Faith & Repentance; so that he stands a guiltless. (3) Man is sanctified & freed from the power of sin, by the Holy Spirit, & by him vitally united to Christ, wh. union comes in salvation.

The school of Wilberforce ~~[illegible]~~ pervert this sequence & give pretty much all to the Incarnation — a grievous error.

B ~~Atonement~~ Statement of the Doctrine: that Jesus, the anointed person, God & Man, the one Mediator, by His death on the Cross, offered a vicarious sacrifice once for all, for all men, reconciled God to them, them to God, redeemed them, made it possible that the guilt of original sin and of actual transgression should be forgiven & that man should be sanctified by the Holy Ghost & brought in the end to everlasting life; It is therefore one sole foundation for time & for eternity.

Order of consideration. (1) Previous difficulties. (2) Doctrines, explained & proved. (3) Erroneous forms of holding or stating it.

1. Previous difficulties. In general these they all come under Bp. Butler's argument; If the ordinary moral government of the world is believed to be of God: If there are difficulties in it; If there are analogous parallel difficulties in Revelation; As in the former case, notwithstanding those difficulties ~~in Revelation~~ ~~[illegible]~~

Perhaps it contradicts proud idea of a divinity.
Sacrifices in all ages, everywhere, [illegible],

See B. —

the moral government of the world is accepted as of God: then in the latter, they cannot justly be alleged.

Objections: - A - It is inconsistent with God's character that (a) the innocent should suffer for the guilty, or (b) that man should not instantly be replaced on repentance. But we reply (a) in wars, pestilences, famines, the innocent do suffer with & for the guilty; & (b) repentance does not at once in ordinary life put a man where he was.

B. It contradicts man's convictions of right, that God should require for reconciliation anything outside a man's self. We deny it. The idea that He does is universal; it lies at the root of all religions.

C. It is a roundabout way to accomplish a result. We do not say that He could not contrive any other way; we only say He did not. This is no question at all. Good comes in a very roundabout way to us.

2 Doctrine proved & explained; to do this it must be taken to pieces, & each piece separately considered -

(a) Christ i.e. anointed Matt. xvi.16; (b) Jesus i.e. Saviour. Matt. 1. 21. 25 - 1 (c) God & Man, Matt. I. 23; Luke II. 52; Phil. II, 5, 6, 7; 1 Tim. iii, 16; Heb. 1. 8. 10; Heb. II, 16: (d) the one Mediator, 1 Tim. II. 5; Heb. xii, 24. (e) by His death on the cross offered a vicarious sacrifice, John 1. 29; Heb. x ii. 27; 1 Pet. III. 18; II. 24; ... (f) once ...

Coleridge's words were called "Salvation made easy or every man his own Redeemer"

Calvinists made God vengeful — but He is Love.

Heathens had dim intimations — Plato's perfect man, & Socrates & Prometheus victims & death. "Knowledge by suffering"

Abp Magee — "If you come & there remember thy brother hath aught against thee" — he worked it out.

Calv. say Christ made large aside his own & God his wrath;

Ch. [illegible] — God satisfied — his holy requirement justice by Christ's Sacrifice. Others say Christ died to satisfy the claims of Satan!

Heb. VII; 27; IX, 12, 26; X. 12, 14; (g) for all men, John I. 29; Rom V. 18; 1 Cor XV, 22; (h) reconciled them to God, & God to them, Rom V. 10; Eph II. 16; Col I. 20. II Tim II. 5; Gal III. 20; (i) redeemed them, Eph I. 7. Col I. 14; Heb IX, 12; 1 Pet I, 18, 19; Rev. V. 9, (k) made it possible that sin should be forgiven, John I, 29; Eph. I. 7; Heb. X. 17; 1 John I. 7; (l) that man should be sanctified by the Holy Spirit, Eph II, 13; Titus II 5-6. Heb IX, 13, 14; XV 15, 16; (m) & brought to everlasting life; Rom V. 21, Heb IX. 28, Rev. VII, John V. 10 &c.

3 Errors of denial, of statement, of development.

a. Unitarians deny it; see answer by the H.S. proof above.

b. The same persons say that the H.S. de an saint be reconciled to God but not God to us. Answered by Abp. Magee [Serm 1 & notes XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII] The very name mediator implies two parties.

c. Confusion of redemption & salvation: these must be kept distinct. R. is the poss. of being saved; Salv. the actual gift. Otherwise, either the saved only are redeemed, or else the redeemed are all saved; the one, Calvinism, & the other Universalism.

d. Denial that original guilt receives or needs forgiveness: ~~the~~ point considered ante.

e. The old N.E. doctrine; accepted the idea of a vicarious sacrifice; but made it absolute beyond all conditions afterwards; turned possibilities into

God desired to forgive sin but afraid of endless confusion & he showed his hatred of sin in the Son for exhibition.

There was love shown in Jehovah & [illegible]

H.S. not declared the rationale of Atonement.

actualities; put all human transgressions into one scale, & balanced them by Xts merits in the other: & thus as soon as men escaped from Calvinism, disposed them to Universalism. It was a profane & worldly or market place view of the Doctrine: #

f. The modern N. E. theology wh. is a sort of Yankee contrivance to "get round" a difficulty. This ignores any piacular character of the Atonement; and reduces it to a mere exhibition of God's hatred of sin: this works on man's moral & intellectual nature, & induces him to forsake sin & be holy. Redemption, Reconciliation, Atonement may be retained in name in this scheme but they are emasculated.

We answer: (a) Xts death was prepared for by prophecy, type, dispensation, two thousand of years: It must therefore have been different from & greater than any that went before. But this is no more of an exhibition of anger against sin, than in the Deluge, Sodom, or the drowning of the Egyptians &c it is impossible that it should be an adequate explanation. If it is replied, that it differs in the Xts, here exhibited, we reply that this makes the difference one of degree only, not of kind, & we after all leaves us on the same level with the subjects of these other displays of God's anger against sin. Heb. is clear against this.

\# Butlers Anal. Pt. II c. V. & VI ad fin.

B. L. theology is so subjective – Puritanism & Revivalism!

It also makes the entire process & work of the Atonement subjective, uninfluential except on those who know about it. ~~Scripture is clear against this.~~

Note: The point, worn & needing to be insisted on is the vicarious nature of the atonement, its being a Satisfaction. Here too great care cannot be taken. All mindful of calling to mind that it is not unconditional: that redemption, i.e. the possibility of being saved, is what the Atonement works, & this leaves room for after conditions. The subject of Sacrifice should also be studied in connection with this. #

The efficacy of the Sacrifice, from the Fall to the end of all things: its prospective merits pleaded in Heaven from the Fall, & it prefigured on Earth in bloody sacrifices before it was actually made on the Cross: after that, yet the intercessor pleads its merits in Heaven, & it is commemorated in the Holy Communion.

Incidentally at this point occurs the question as to our Lord's condition between Death & Resurrection:

(a) Vital union of soul & body dissolved & they separated.

Magee on Atonement & Sac. Scott's Xtn Life, Part II. c. viii, of the Mediator; Oxford Sermons on the Atonement; Pearson on the Creed; Butler's Anal. Part II, c. v.
Blunt – the Atonement & the Att one maker.

2ndly Hades & Gehenna wh. is final punishment. Then intermediate — People think is half way happiness & misery — but a state between Death & Resurrection

United with him in Incarnation? Pantheism

after the Resurrection by the Spirit

(b) Body in the grave, but delivered from corruption. Matt. XXVIII, 60; Acts, II, 27, 31.
(c) Soul in Hades, [Acts II, 27, 31] a Paradise; [Luke XXIII, 43] this is all N. S. ~~teaches~~ as unless 1 Peter III, 19 bears on this matter, but this is in debate, the others are not.

C The Resurrection.

(1) as a fact; (2) as a Doctrine connected with the Incarnation & the Passion. As a doctrine it rests on an objective fact.

(1) Belongs to Evidences - but note (a) those who deny the fact. (b) those who allegorize.

(2) Order & sequence of events & statements
In the Incarnation our Lord becomes the Mediator and Representative of the race;
In the Passion, He offers the vicarious Sacrifice of the Incarnation Lord;
In the Resurrection, He becomes the Head and King of the Mediatorial Kingdom, which he won by the merits of His Life & Death;
In the Ascension & Session, He takes the Kingdom; they being His coronation & enthronization
He is now the second Adam, the Spiritual Head of the race; regenerating those begotten after the condition of the first Adam. Note the parallel. Adam did not begat fleshly sons till after the fall. Christ did not begat

When no man can become a member of the Church, he must be to be saved

Man is tied to the sacraments, God is not, while people often seem to think that God is tied to his sacraments; & many that man is not.

Church is no more between a man & God than any means & end; might as well say that Parents are put between children & God in creating them. Sacraments are like words or books & forms of prayer & no more. The only kind of man who teaches it is sort who believes in Opus Operatum Sacraments in gross way & even Romanists hardly

* pushes some points too far
Scott on Mediatorial Office contains essence of Divinity

spiritual sons till after the evil of the fall
was conquered and undone.

Here, then, Xt comes in contact with mans souls; but it is by the Holy Spirit, His Vicar. #1

Mans want twofold: (1) deliverance from the punishment of sin, & (2) from the power of sin.

The 1st is justification, the 2d sanctification: both resting on the Atonement, & made actual gifts in the Res. & Asc.

Here then we meet with the Mediatorial Kingdom, i.e. the Xtn Ch, as the agent by wh. these gifts, were ordinarily, without limiting Gods power to be dispensed.

Herein is remission of sins: sanctifying grace: sufficing knowledge by (a) the illumination of the Spirit, (b) the word of God, (c) the teaching of the ministry, who are also the divinely appointed administrators of the means of Grace.

This shows the true relation of the Church & Sacraments to Xt on the one side, & man on the other; i.e. means to an end. #2

#2 Horsley; Nine Sermons on the Res; H. Sermons on the XL days: Moberly on the XL days, cum cautela; John Scott on Xt's days [illegible] Vol. III.

#1 John XVI, 7: Eph. ii. 18

2 Justification

1. Here more than almost anywhere, we need a careful & precise definition: on account of confusion in use of the term. To arrive at such definition, we must consider the use of the word in the H.S.

It comes in three forms, as a verb, adjective, noun: & connected with all, there is a variety of usage. Commonly however a judicial or forensic idea comes in [1] so that the N.T. idea is, pardon, with a covenant title to salvation.

So far as we can find this was the idea of the prim. Ch. Statements however not scientific but sufficient; [2] It is beyond question that of the Reformed Churches. Rome almost confounded it with sanctification. [3] Even the Schoolmen were correct on this point. Note its difference from sanctification or renovation, & regeneration.

2. Such being the nature of justification i.e. Pardon & Covenant title to salvation, neither absolute, both conditional, clearly it is a thing which God gives & man receives. This the relation of the two parties.

I. God gives it, & is its fountain: for His Son's sake

---

[1] Rom IV. 5-6-7: Rom V. 9 contr. with V. 10: Rom VIII. 18: & the Tenor of all.

[2] Clem. Rom. I. Epist ad Cor. 32

[3] Creed of Pius IV. Council of Trent, Sess. V.

St James wrote against some sort of Antinomianism
Faith is a less dangerous word in regard
to personal assumption but often made meritorious

1- before grace
2- after grace given
3- but still would sin

But motives are
much mixed

Attrition + penances &c = Contrition
there really is no place for [illegible].

who is the meritorious cause; #1 by the Holy Spirit, as the Vicar of Xst; #2 then on man's side there must be of course faith, repentance & future obedience.

And now to bring the two parties together, there is the ordinance of Baptism. #3

But God is not tied to His ordinances, tho' we are when we can receive them: otherwise of course not.
(*interlined above "ordinances":* workings to His own)

4. Of the faith, which is so principal and sh. a condition on the part of man. It must be living; Bp. Burnett says "the faith mentioned by St. Paul, is the complex of all &c; "St Paul & St James do not differ.

5. To see how so apparently simple a doctrine came to its position of importance, we must enter into some historical details. It all grows out of the Scholastic Theology, w its results in relation to human merit. Five points are to be noted.

1 Merit de congruo: a work in a man's own strength fitting him for grace

2. Merit de condigno: a work done by grace and absolutely deserving grace.

3 Attrition - sorrow arising from fear of punishment, Contrition sorrow arising from ~~fear~~ love of God

#3 Mark xvi, 16; John iii. 35; Act ii. 38; Act xx, 6. &c

#1 Gal. I. 14 #2 Titus iii. 5-6.7

Ep. 10 – the elect are those called to grace in this world.
– οἱ κλητοὶ ἅγιοι – the ~~ἅγιος~~ κλητός no more sure of eternal
life than the ἅγιος – so epistles were addressed

Dean T. a contemporary says in Med. times Church
was so commonly applied to the edifice & there
was danger of confusion

Acts II. 47 is doubt. used.

Ch. never treated abstractedly & as free from God

3 The Church — Some preliminary points

(a) the word. (b) other names in H.S (c) Types. & the extent of the application of the word.

a Word derived from ἐκκλησία; root idea therefore is calling or electing. So Χριστιανοὶ are κλητοὶ called i.e. to Christian privileges in this world. In its evident signification it means any body of people called together. On the other hand congregation means a coming together, not necessarily called by any one. — The calling in this case can only be by God Himself. Papists have tried to make a handle of this in use of the word congregation.[†1] In the N.T. word strictly [for an ordinary use of the word see Acts xix 32, 41, the word is applied in five diff ways. (1) to a family [Rom xvi. 1–] ^probably^ (2) to those collected under one Pastor [I Cor. xi. 22] (3) to the congregations in one city — a diocese [I Cor 1.2 : I Thess. I. 1: II Thess. I. 1 : Rev. 1. 4, 11 &c] (4) to the Authorities of the Church [Matt. xviii. 17] (5) to the general assembly of professing believers. (a) on earth — (b) with the saints & angels in Heaven — [Acts ii: 47. xx. 28 Heb. xii - 22 - 23 - 24][x2]

(b) Various other names in H.S. all which intimate, near and close relations: the home idea predominating — the House of God [I. Tim. iii. 15] the city of God [Ps. XLVIII. 1: Heb. xii. 22: Rev. xxi. 2] the new or heavenly Jerusalem [as above] the tabernacle of God [Rev. xxi. 3] the seed of

---

x2 Field on the Church Book I. Ch. X

†1 Field on the Ch. – Book 1. ch. V. Browne on Art. xix.

Only object. to Paradise, is that of Bp. Marsh that the N.T. alone shows us what are the types

Only of the Holy, as P. S. say
Also Parable of the Leaven.

Pusey urges an inadmissibility of post-baptismal sin

(Gal. iii. 29) the body of Xt. (Col. i. 24) the bride of Xt. (Rev. xxi. 2) cf. Canticles – the flock of God (Acts xx. 28) & the Kingdom of Heaven. (Marion)

(c) Types of the Ch. (a) O.T. (b) N.T.

(a) Paradise, probably (So St. Aug. Hooker Bk V. Jeremy Taylor) Eve, probably (So St. Aug. cf. a curious book called the Counter [struck] Theory. Note the Romanist pervert tried to be a type of the Virgin.) the Ark (I Pet. iii 20, 21. cf. the Baptismal Service.) Sarah (Gal. iv) the temple at Jerusalem. Daniel's vision of the stone cut without hands is a typical prophecy. (Fairbairn's Typology #)

(b) In N.T. no types but parables & visions, are quasi-types & involve the same general principle. Some important cases – the Drag net, the field of wheat & tares, the grain of Mustard seed, (Matt. xiii) Peter's vision of the sheet (Acts x) the first two answer puritan & Calvinistic objections as to the composition of the Church – the third anticipates skeptical objections as to its slow growth & the 4th was the correction of Judaism.

(d) Extent of the application of the word. The Ch. really only dates from the day of Pentecost – but in some sense there clearly was a church from the Paradisaic promise. In short God's plan was all along one & the same as to the thing over is Xt – but various in degree of fullness in different dispensations

\# See P. 12. & Pusey Tract on Bapt, by no means however endorsing his vi[ews]

St. Stephen warrants ~~[?]~~ [Acts vii. 38] calling the Jewish dispensation the Church.

Gallican – Pope inferior to Council – Ultram – superior
" not necessarily Bp. of Rome primacy. " both is.
" recognises – National churches – " not.
Flourished in 1680 circ.; Bossuet &c.; in 1830 the revolutions dissevered Ch. & St. & the Ch. having no support turned to ultramontane views.

Romanism 1. Xt gave a jus divinum to St. Peter over all Ch., & to successors, & Bps of Rome are these. 2. Whole Ch. gave Bp. of Rome supremacy & no national church can take it away. 3. Bp. of Rome was Patriarchate of the West & Anglican comes under it. Ans. 1 is always the last if it isnt the 1st.

Convocation only in Henry I; never received Royal sanction
Lancelot pubs. it in 1689 p. Hon. 75.

Dispensations, the Patriarchal, Jewish, Xtian. In each a Priesthood & sacred rites, differing of course in various ways. In each its three offices, Priestly, Royal & Prophetical represented - [On this most important matter see #1

B Theories of the organization & constitution of the Ch. three in No. (1) the Romish (2) the Parity (3) the Anglican - Subdivisions as we advance. (1) makes the Ch. a Monarchy centering in one head the Pope, Xt's vicar, successor of St. Peter, Bp. of Rome. (a) Gallican (b) Ultra-montane #2
their diff. do not come into account here. The Romish view rests clearly on the Papal Supremacy. If that is disproved or not proved it falls. This great question comes under 3 forms -
I a pure divine Supremacy over entire Ch. given by Xt to St Peter from him transmitted to his successors the Bp. of Rome -
II An Ecclesiastical Supremacy over the entire church given by the Cath. Ch. & not be abrogated by any inferior power -
III a Western Patriarchate. Whenever they begin with Romanists gen. slide into the 1st.

#2 Hook's Dict. Ch. of France, Concordat, Pragmatic Sanct. Palmer on the Ch. Book 1. Ch. xi]

#1 Faber's Diff. Dispensations, Field on the Ch. Book I, Beatle's Convocation - Book - very valuable. Bp. Wilson's Perpet. Gov. of Xt's Ch. Ch. [illegible]

I. The Jure divino. Observe if this grant of this to St Peter is disproved the whole ends. Or the ... of Peter's supremacy were established several other points to be proved before the Papacy is established also. Great proof texts are Matt. xvi. 18. 19: John xxi. 17 &c. In stating Rom. arrangement I follow generally Bellarmine [De Rom. Pont. I] Matt xvi. 18. 19. he says - contains the grant of supremacy under two metaphors (a) the rock (b) the keys. The former to make Peter the head, the latter the governor of the Ch. Ans. cf. 1 Cor. III. 11. Eph. II. 20; 18. 5. Here Ct is the Head, Apostles & Prophets the foundation. If to this is replied we distinguish between primary & secondary foundations then we reply again, all apostles are secondary foundations as much as St Peter. Besides the same grant is made to the other apostles, in Matt. xviii. 18 John xx. 21, 22, 23. Consider also our Lord's reply to Peter in Matt. xix. 28: the case of Salome, Matt. xx. 20, etc, & the events at the last supper. Luke xxii. 24, etc.

On John XXI. 16, 17 Bellarmine argues from the words ποίμαινε μου τὰ πρόβατα. He distinguishes ποίμαινε fr. βόσκε & makes it a regal word implying imperial power over the Church. But cf. Acts xx. 28: 1 Peter v. 2, as answering this

he makes pom equiv & all, a quibble answered by the same references. He disting. & separates fr upwca making the former the Bps & the latter the people at large. = the ewe mothers of the flock"!! Read John x after that fashion. The true view of the passage is that by the threefold answering of the threefold ~~charge~~ denial & by a threefold charge Jst. restored Peter to an equality with his brother apostles. Finding other passages intimating superiority on the part of Peter are quoted by Papists as Matt. xix. 27 & Luke v. 3 etc. Bellarmine enumerates over twenty but all together do not prove a supremacy – they are more than counterbalanced by our Lords rebukes to Peter Matt. xvi. 23 Luke

4 Holy Scriptures; Rule of Faith.

Under this general head I propose to consider and thus cover the entire ground the topics contained in Articles vi. vii. viii, xxi. These topics so to speak - underlie theology. Art xxi is named, tho' omitted in our American P. B.: and it is equally proper to consider Art. viii as it is in the English book & not in ours. For the reason of this see the Preface to our book at the end of the last paragraph save one. The doctrine of the Trinity is an essential point of doctrine: the view of Gen. Councils is an "essential point" of discipline; and in neither do we depart from the mother church.

Arrangement of Topics:

1. Relation of the Ch. to the H. S. Scriptures,
II. The word canonical, & what Scripture contains.
III. Canon of N. T.
IV. Canon of O. T.
V. Relation of O & N.
VI. Apocrypha.
VII. Script & Ch. in relation to art of faith
VIII. Gen Councils
IX. The Creeds

? — 1r.6

I This question underlies all proofs and enquiries, as to the genuineness & authenticity of either Old or New Testament. Our method of enquiry a careful examination of fact; on such a basis alone can we reason.

1. The primary facts are these. (1) Our Lord during 'the 40 days' instructed the Apostles concerning the 'establishment of the Church.'[1] (2) On Pentecost, Church established in descent of Holy Ghost[2] (3) Church became living & working institution in the world. We must enquire, then, how much this involves.

2. Now, a priori, this implies three things: an Organization more or less complete: a Doctrine: and a Worship. All these must necessarily have existed; and [Acts, II, 42;] history confirms the position

3. Not a word of N. Test. was yet written, nor was till sometime later on: whence it follows that for organization & Worship, we look in the N.T. not for specific directions & commands, but for recognitions of what was already in existence. Hence the unsystematic form of N.T.

4. But we are specially concerned with Doctrine: & that not merely in detail, but considered as a whole. [1 Tim. IV. 16: Jude 3]

2 Acts II. 1. sq.
1 Acts 1.3 – Cf. Our Lord's sayings in Gospel

τυπον διδαχης – context suggests only rules of life, particularly Xt as example – but this *includes* of course the whole Creed.

5. Some general form or summary, a pri., probable, from the nature of case: for since a common doctrine was preached by the Apostles, and believed by the converts, & since people confessedly made some confession of faith in Baptism, they must almost of necessity have used some summary.

6 With this antecedent possibility, we go to the N.T. The evidence is cumulative: no one passage asserts it in terms, but there are very many which taken together make a strong case. Passages and expressions; τῇ διδαχῇ τ. ἀποστ. [Acts II. 42] τὴν πίστιν [II Tim. iv. 7] [Jude 3] τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ [I Tim. iv. 13, 16] τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, ἐν πολ. μαρτ. [I Tim. vi. 12] τὴν παραθήκην [I Tim. vi. 20; II Tim. I, 14] ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαινόντων λόγων [II Tim. I, 13] and this could not have been the O.T. or the N.T. for it was received from St. Paul, which the O.T. was not, [II Tim. iii. 15 –] and the N.T. was not all written, nor at all collected: besides the main word means a pattern, [I Tim I. 16] or an archetype; τύπον διδαχῆς; [Rom. vi. 17] notice here the case in Aug. version.[2] This same deposit, Timothy is "to commit to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others" [I Tim. i. 18; II Tim. ii. 2] and this is over & above the general charge

2 See Hesychius on word, cf. St Basil de Bapt. I. c. ii.

1 See Suicer's T. under the word.

to preach the gospel. Now recur to the principle of appeal laid down above in (3), and will any thing answer the conditions of the case, except some summary of doctrine, which will on the whole, be tantamount to a creed?

7. The question occurs: can we form any reasonable conjecture, as to what this summary was? I think we can.

(a) The a pri. probability. This grounded on the apostolical commission[1]. How are people discipled into a name? By teaching them the doctrine of the Name: & then they would naturally profess their belief in it, before they were baptized into it. The Divine name has always in this way contained doctrine.[2] And it is ^not likely that believers would be baptized into the name without confessing the doctrine. This, then, would be, a pri. point to the baptismal formula, as probably the original summary.

(b) I think the testimony of H.S. looks the same way. The case of Ethiopian Eunuch, [Acts viii. 37 (83)] that of Timothy, [I Tim. vi. 12] of the Samaritans, [Acts viii. 12] compared with Rom. x. 10. go to show two things, (1) some confession required, (2) that it consisted

2 Interludy XL days. 199, 200 Ed. 2.

1 Matt xxviii. 19

in a professed belief in the name of Jesus Christ, or something tantamount to that. It therefore remains to enquire what this meant. On this point we argue, that since baptising in the name of the Holy Trinity, a fair believing & professing belief in the Holy Trinity: this is the brief statement: but Pearson & Dr Moberly argue it at length.[1]

(C) we reach same conclusion, by an exam. of ancient creeds, & fragments collect. by Bingham.[2] All reducible to 3 great div. under 3 words, Father, Son, & Holy Ghost. Direct testimony also of Fathers.[3]

8. Use of such a summary.

(1) It was a profession & that was demanded.[4]

(2) It would be a test of preaching. Apostles preached first, and next wrote God's word: and this summary would enable the converts to fulfil very satisfactorily such an injunction as St Paul's in Gal. i. 8. For such erroneous teaching began very early in Church. The epistles are full of ~~it~~ allusions to it.

9. Object. – this view makes H.S. needless, & puts a weapon in hands of the Papist.

4 Rom X. 10

3 Bull, Jud. Eccl. Cath. c. iv. v. vi & Grabe's note; Mob. app. 290. Blunt's Ch. iii. cent c. ii; Par. Priest. Lect. ix.

2 X. c. iv.

1 Pearson Art. I. & note (p 47) Mob., as ab., App. 287 3rd ed.

What was the summary? Matt xxviii. 19.
Acts viii. 12. Rom x. 10

Bingham X. 4

Some summary needed to ascertain the right teachers

So we see how congregations are misled & at mercy of preachers

By oral tradition Rome does not mean creeds or summaries, or ritual but

changed now by ~~Development~~;

but no reason can be given for the distinction.

Kible on Tradition.

Art. XXI. Just omitted because Primas necessary — but as we state that we dissent from Ch. of E. in nothing essential, so we must hold ~~the three~~ of Councils.
Holy Script. & Rule of faith.

A priori, — must be doctrine — go teach — Organization, Doctrine, Worship. —
Apostles doctrine, fellowship & breaking of bread & prayers.

1 Tim. IV. 16 Ty Sidask. — body of doctrine.

On a priori grounds, a summary of doctrine is ~~a~~ probable: & so in baptism. Some sort of profession every body must & every has had.

Evidence of Apostles having doctrine is cumulative & Rom vi. 17 / 14

Acts 2. 42 I Tim. VI. 12 II Tim I. 13

If it be true it can do neither. But does it favor the Popish oral tradition. The Papist holds God's word to consist of, 1. written (Scripture) 2. [unwritten] tradition. This last, not God's word, as first preached, and then written by the Apostles; nor the summary in the creeds; not the tradition of rites & ceremonies; nor Hermeneutical tradition; but a tradition of Doctrine &c, transmitted from Apostles, of coordinate and equal authority with the written word, & found in the existing Roman Church in any & every given age.[2]

The view just taken has nothing in common with this! According to it, the only oral trad. during Apost. lifetime: to save even this from corruption and to serve as a test they added the summary, & then wrote God's word as the grand safeguard for all. This supposition & no other meets the case. Against it the Romanist must prove, (1) a body of oral teaching of Apostles, over & above H.S., and (2) that an infallible guide to it was appointed to take the place of the Apostles. This he cannot do. If he could, he would only prove the uselessness of the written H.S.

10. Again it may be asked, why would not this creed do without H.S.? Because (1) the written

[2] Mild on Ch. IV, c. xx. Gibson's Preserv. Lit. IV, c. 3, Vol. Ed.
[1] Conc. Trent. Sess. iv.

God gives authority; Ch. is witness of its origin

The inward witness does confirm & enlighten

1. Written word is a safeguard against corruptions. 2. a great deal was needed beside such summary; expansions ~~explanations~~ of doctrine, Rules of Life, the Lord's Life, history of the Church &c.

11.

12. Relations of Ch. & N.T. (1) Par. case — not Roman view but as a judge deciding on the constitutionality of a law passed by legislature. Testimony of Ch. necessary & precedes Scr. Word of God. I

(2) there is an "inward witness", but not this only II

3. Evidences, but not only.

I. Ancient. (a) What are inspired books. Two tests (1) Apostolic preaching & Summary of the Faith. (2) Ch. clear knowledge of the charact. of writers, their claims. (b) & witness contemporaneously & the authenticity & genuineness

II Modern. (a) & continue previous testimony, (versions (?) catalogues, MSS? quotations?) (b) & guard from corruption; (c) & proclaim them. II

Canons. Inspiration. Our Ch. (1) defines what H.S. contains Art VI. & (2) requires at ordination declaration of belief that O & N. T. are the word of God. (Cust. Art. VII), & that "contain all things nec. to salvation", & Art. VI.

---

11 Hooker, 3.8.14.

II V. Knox Phil. Jones on Can. v. 1, p. 44: of Belgic & French confessions with our Art VI; Words. p. 14

I Wordsworth on Ins. & Can. p. 21 cdn. Ed. Rom. claim in Perrones Praelectiones II. p. 1051-2.

Lemmas, catalogues, ^copies, references continued contemp. writer.

Probably Romish could be brought & certainly Gk. would agree with this view.

Theories of inspiration prevail where Ch's historic testimony has been given up.

A Early Ch. in contest with Montanists who asserted themselves passive instruments declared this a proof of their having no right to claim true inspiration; theirs was after the diabolic possession.

Bp. Wilson of Ky. held degrees, following Cath. Rabbins. Maurice believes no diff. from inspiration of all good men.

A. never in early Ch.

Theories come in after reformation. I Mechanical^I, II. the Human (1) Bible contains word of God. (2) of Degrees, from later Jews & Maimonides (3) Schleiermacher depending & poetic inspiration.

Dynamic — "Divine influence employs human faculties" I Cor xii:6. the two are truly, perfectly, indivisibly, distinctly represented.^II

II Canonical, קָנֶה, a rod; a determination: All Gk. writers & κανων at Alex, rule or model of good writing. Now it is collection of Books wh. constitute the original written Rule of the Faith, & any Book wh. is a part of that is canonical. Art. vi. rather loose, & Fathers use it loosely.^III

III Can. N.T. I Gosp., Acts, 13 Ep. Paul, 1 Pet., 1 John, are
II Jas, II Pet, 2 & 3 John, Jude.
III Hebrews Revelation ^IV Romanists call II & III (exc. Heb), Deuterocanonical, to insinuate that Apocrypha is on same ground. Eusebius has two classes, ὁμολογ = I & ἀντιλογ = II & III His 3d νοθα includes none of N.T.

The standpoint is Counc. of Chal. 451, wh.

---

^IV Eusebius. E. H. 3, 3, 25

^III Bp. Cosin on Canon, ch. 1; Jones on Can, 1 pp 14, 20. Words. pp 5=12; Espec. Westcott on Can. App. A.

^I Gaussen

^II Lee on Insp. (App. c.). Kr Remembr. Jan. 1856; Ch. Rev. Apr. 1856

^III Hooker. 2.238. cf. Words. Insp. & N.T. p. xviii. S. Aug. in Words. p. xlii ad fin.

Dynamic is like working of Spirit in forming characters. Romish theory casts the "Saints" all in one mould; & so other theories. Comes out strikingly in St Theresa & St Francis of Assisi. And Puritanic theory, working itself out so completely that in two or three generations people _all_ began to _look_ alike, craniologically & facially.

See on Inspiration its best book.

The Comforter's own testimony & his bringing to remembrance

took into Code of Univ. Ch. & sanctioned decrees of Laod. 365, — wh. omitted only Rev., for spec. reason. (Can. 60 Laod)
(a) M.SS. (b) Versions, (c) Catalogues, (d) Quotations, & they all tend to one point I

IV Can. O.T. Josephus tells what it was when Ch. sanctioned it, wh. was same as now, — omitting Apoc. He adds, no one changed it, Jews would die for it.
Alex. can. not diff. LXX was made 250 at least B.C. & hist. of Apoc. had not taken place; and All Jewish test. closes canon in Ezras time; & no break between Jerus. & Alex.
Only one Counc. Carthage, where Hebrew was unknown incl. the Apoc., 397; but Laod, 364 does not, & the Ch. did not at Chalced.
Their date is Counc. of Trent, 1546.
Papists say that Fathers quote them, — but the Fath. did not know Heb. & Jerome excludes, (2) Scripture used loosely. II

V Relation of O. & N.T. N.T. veiled in O.T. III
VI Use of Apocrypha III (exc. Graves)
VII Relations to Ch. as to Arbt of Faith. Scr. not to be expounded contradictorily.

III Browne, Burnet, Bev., on Art. vii; Graves Pent., Heys Lect.
I Cave Hist. Lit. p. 62. Wds. on Canon, App. in Eng. ed.; Westcott on Can, esp. Append; Jones; p. 27, 33 Browne on Art vi; Wds. on
II Apocal. III & IV; Fab. on Apoc. Books pt. 2, p. 395; Wds. in Can. Lect. 15
Bp. Cosin is exhaustive.

Rome in Trent Sess iv. Canon 1, Art II Creed of Pius; alleges (a) Gods word contained in written Script:, (b) unwritten tradit; wh. coordinate & equal. Script. to be interp. only in accord with uniform & unanimous consent of Fathers, & in sense in wh. Ch. has & does hold.

Word tradition in H.S. means,(a) tread. of usage, 1 Cor. xi. 6, (b) or the Creed, (c) or sometimes the Epistles. Papists say the Pope or Ch (never settled which) guides infallibly. But what proves this? Recent notion.

But help is needed to get at the meaning. Ch. keeps & witnesses. But

1. She cannot create new doctrine
2. " " make contradict or wrest the Word
3. " " deny Scr.
4. " is a witness to the harmony of doct.
5. " does not (as matter of fact) impose a special sense on any text. She transmits the body of essential Faith in the Cath. Creeds, & that being safe, allows a variety of individl. expos.
6. She limits the individual only as in number 5.

Rome shuffles all traditions together, & moreover involves in a tremendous dilemma, in the 2nd Art of Pius.[1]

---

[1] Vincent of Lerins Comm; Gibsons Preserv; Sir H. Lyndes Via Tuta; Palmer on Ch. Keble on Trad. (cum cautela) & notes; Bp. Jebb on Vinc. Lir.; Hooker then Reform. Reasons for leaving Ch. of Rome.

VIII[E] Gen. Counc. Art. of Anglic. Ch. XXI not to be taken as intimating a difference.

Warrant is found in the action of Apostles when the first question came up. Acted on afterwards; 30, 37th Apost. Can. & case of Paul of Samos. in 270.[I]

Acceptance by Ch at large cond. Gen. Council. As Pope never confirmed 4 gen. Council either they are not such or his conf. is not necessary.

Rome makes more than 20. Only 6 have been accepted.

The art. in regard to Princes was intended to oppose the Papal power. [II]

Office to reaffirm & testify. [III]
To enable a Counc. to act there must have been denial of doct. & an appeal by both to H.S.
Also questions of practice. [IV]

IX Creeds.

1. Newmans theory, that germs given, & infallibly developed.

2. Puritans, say that Ch. invented new terms & new doct. & imposed them on men.

IV Laud agt Fisher; Abp Bramhall; Palmer on Ch.

III Bull's Defensio

II Burnet, Browne, Dr. Hey.

I Schaff's Apost. Ch., & Cen. & Hows.

Agree with Rom. in holding to development according to infallibility of human consciousness

1. Faith was once for all given, to be kept, adhered to, preserved.

2. The additions are occasioned by heretical denials and are negative in operation.

3. No new truth added, but old more logically & fully stated: implicit made explicit.

4. To see doct. in new connections is not to enlarge domain, — to state them in more carefully guarded terms, is not.

5. Development from one dispens. to another does not point to development in a given disp. unless revelation is kept up. Theodel falls into error.

Council of Trent & Westminster Assembly have erred here, & they the only bodies in modern time that have II

II Harvey's Hist. of 3 Creeds; Bp. Moberly's pref. to Sayings.

5. Sacraments & Means of Grace

I Gen. Consid.

1 Definitions. (a) Something hidden & secret; cf. the Gk. μυστήριον. (b) A mere sign of a sacred thing; so common in Fathers. (c) in theology with proper & strict sense. Our def. found in Cat. , in Art. 25, involves 3 things; (1) an outward sign, (2) an inward, personal, sanctifying grace, (3) institution by Xt. This is justified by H.S, Gk. Ch, Prot. Conf. & Rom. Ch. I

2 Distinguish 4fold state. I. Paradisaic State, - the Tree of Life II The Patriarchal Dispensation - bloody sacrifice, with circumcision added. ~~temp A.~~ time of Abraham III Jewish - Circumcision & Sacrifice, Paschal Lamb. IV Xtn - Baptism & the Holy Com. Papists deny any sacramental character to old Sacrifices exc. in case of Pasch. lamb. II

3 Sacraments of O.T. brought into & kept in covenant, betokened remission of sin in actually remitting legal transgressions. Those of N.T. are not only tokens but channels, - betoken remission, & to the worthy recipient seal & convey pardon of original & actual sin & convey grace.

II Oxnall's Comm. book. Magee on Atone.

I Plato c. 29 Halls collect. Rom. Cat. pt 2, c. 1, n. 9

4. The outward sign is visible or it could not be outward: (a) tries faith by natural inadequacy (Brazen Serpent, Naaman, Marriage at Cana, Raising of Lazarus) (b) to support faith as visible memorial & pledge (c) to prove visible membership in visible Ch. (d) to exhibit God's power. (Try the 5 Rom. sacraments by the test of analogy, in feeding by bread & washing.
All Protestant Churches say effective signs I
Sacramentum in voto is earnest desire when sacrament cannot be had. II

II Number of Sac.
1. Our doct. wh. is that of all Prot. in Conf. & Art. 25. Trent Sess 7, c. 1 & Art 3 of Pius Creed; Gk Ch. means us, Platon c. 30.
Fathers use word loosely. The word generally in Conf. & Art xvii = generaliter, schol., log., sense of universally. Rome must except from her def. Orders & Matrimony. In 1st Xt did not give outward sign; grace not personal sanctification. Penance not outward sign. III And so with others.

III Browne & Owen on No. of Sacs. Gibbons Reuss. Sir H. Lynde's (Via tuta, &c)
II Trent Sess. 13. c. 8. Rubric in Comm. Sick.
I Harder. Art. Hall's Coll. Browne & Hey on Art

VI Baptism

1. Meanings of word. (a) simply washing (b) legal washings of Jews.[I] (c) metaphorically sufferings & death[II] (d) in Theology, the Sacrament of our Lord.

2. Other names in H.S.[II]

3. Vid. Bingh. for Math.[III]

4. Types: (a) Ark & Deluge (b) Red Sea But many other.[IV]

5. Jews bapt. proselytes. A rite. John's Bapt. a rite, not a Sac. Bapt. of Apostles during our Lord's life not the Sacrament, wh. was 1st administered on Pentecost.[V]

Our Ch. does not practice [I] aspersion, but does not count invalid. [II] Immersion & [III] Suffusion. Word does not mean submerge (Evidence of Catacombs)

The Form, - the words used by our Lord. App. a conflict arg. from Ac. x, 48, viii, 12, xix. 5 -[V]

Recipients - of Baptism, cont. Anabaptists Itn a development fr. the Jewish. Proved by fact that the App. were not baptized: cf. Rom. xi. 16-24. Infants were admitted under the Jewish:

VI Pearson Creed, & Moberly, Append.

V Acts xix, 4, 5. Lu. iii, 16 Matt xxviii, 19

IV 1 Pet. iii: 21 1 Cor x, 1. 2 Fairbairns Typ. Dr Pusey on Bapt.

III Orig. Eccl. 11. 1

II Eph. v. 26 Tit. iii. 5 poss. Heb. vi. 4 & x. 32

I Mark vii. 4 Mark x. 39, Luc. xii. 50

Bingham

In infants – ignorance & actual innocence take place of faith

Augustine's perseverance, is the grace that enables to persevere.

Unjustified adults are not forgiven original sin

if excluded from Xtn, it would have been so said.
No traces of objections of Jewish parents.
Examine H. S. to find what is recognized.
(a) Children blessed (b) St John iii.3; here Xt says τις; Nicod. says ανθρωπος (c) the commission says all nations, every creature.
(d) S. Peter says the ~~gospel~~ Baptism is to children. (but he could not have said sons.) Act. ii.39
(e) St. Paul says children are holy, set apart, - equiv. to baptized. ~~Act.~~ I Cor. vii.14
Matt. xix.14, Mar x.14 Luk. xviii.16
(f) households baptized.
We appeal to the unvarying practice of the Church. Tertullians objection is from the idea of the irreversibility of post-bapt. sin.
Infants can go to the ch. triumphant & so can enter the Ch. militant; & were once the subjects of a narrower & less glorious covenant. In them the guilt of original sin may be forgiven, as they can place no bar, and a covenant title to grace may be given.
Adults if qualified (Faith & Repentance)[I] fully receive blessings. If unqualified, held in abeyance until conditions are fulfilled.
Remission of Sins Spiritual grace.[II]
To Infants, original guilt remitted; forgiveness

[II] Acts ii.38
[I] Acts ii.38 viii.37 Heb. vi.1

Extreme wing who now (1867-8) want service changed, prob. think visible signs are not means of grace, but something put between us & Xt by ourselves. Quest. & Ans. in Savoy Conf.

& grace covenanted: 1st when actual sin is ~~covenanted~~ repented of, & 2d as soon as soul can receive it.

This is regeneration; a change of spirit & therefore a spiritual change. Not necessarily a change in the spirit actually renewing & holiness. Born out of world into the Church. Ridiculous to say a dwarf never born; absurd to say a not a consistent Christian never regenerated. "Baptismal regeneration" is a bad expression.

Both generated & regenerated children can grow up – but may not, if disturbing causes intervene. A child is born into the world though he be not yet a man, & reborn into the church though he be not yet a complete Chr. The whole question about regeneration, among those who believe that God gives grace by visible means, is one of words.[I]

IV The Holy Communion.

I Rom. II (so called) Lutheran III Zwinglian || IV Primitive

Rom. in 3 heads – Trans. Sacrifice. One kind.

Trans. – found in Art. V. Pope Pius, & Conc. Trid. S. 13.

(1. No one to deny that body & blood, souls &c of Xt fully present

2. No one to say that substance remains or deny the conversion of all (whole) bread into body, species only remaining. 3. Whole Xt

I Hooker Book V. Waterland, Atty tract on Regen. Beveridge & Browne on Art. Walls Inf. Bapt., Dr. Fuller's Sanction, Wychar, Taylor's Apost. Bap. Sadlers Sacram. Respons. Art. in App. Smith's Dict.

See very gross view, printed in Tract xc. Pasch. Rad. 831
Started.

under each species) Duns Scotus admits that Lateran 1215 first employed term, Greeks have μεταστοιχειωσις but declare that transubst. destroys nature of sacram. So Pat. Mosc.

We join issue on H.S., Reason, antiquity.

Rom alleges John vi. words Instit. S.P. in 1 Cor. x. xi. John vi Roman. however are often afraid of it, & so Protestant. v.63 proves it cannot mean trans. Many turned away at its hardness, but He does not explain. At last after supper he says "This is my body, this is my blood." Capharnaites take his words as Romanists. Bp. W. says on vs 62 "is it hard now? how will it be when I am gone away"

In words of instit. ουτος εστι. do not necessarily involve trans. "αυται εισι δυο διαθηκαι. Gal iv. 24. But other reasons show a fuller meaning than here (Gal.).

St. P. in Cor. argues

Eating Idol sac. = partaking of the Idol.

" Xtn Feast = partaking Body & Blood of Xt.

So if trans. is necessary in one case, it is in other. And he says they (the Cup & Bread) are the κοινωνια, of Body & Blood

Reason. Rome says Trinity contradicts evidence of our senses. Not so; never been presented. But bread & wine are submitted to our senses. Do they call it a miracle? But miracles were always offered to ~~our~~ senses. Then if pressed they turn and say, you cannot see it — therefore it is

a mystery! They say substance changed but qualities remain! — accidents they say, a term invented & obscure. But does substance inhere in quality & not v. v.?

Again, Art cannot do more than Xst. Did He break the natural carnal body, or his glorified, either? But it is a mystery — there were two loci, one where was spiritually what was elsewhere carnally.

Antiquity. Early writ. use strong lang. But if 999 places of an author may mean trans. & the 1000th cannot, the latter settles. As Chrys. — the bread after consecration is dignified with the name of the Body of the Lord, tho. the nature of the bread remains in it. Keep to point that modus not definable. Zwinglianism & Transubstantia. not to be balanced, — as they were at Trent, &c.

Study the Fath. arg. agst. Eutychianism! Commenced in 831 Paschasius Radb.

Sacrificium. Rom. Doct. — found in P. IV.'s Creed, Art. V. & Conc. Trident. Sess. XX; 9 ch. & 9 can.

Our doct. in Art. XXXI.

1. Sacrif. Distinctions. We do not deny sac. & we do not assert necess. of blood in a true sacrifice. מנחה proves this. Rome asserts it to be propiatory, & repeating the Sac. of Cross.

Pears. Art. iii., Leo's Letter, ad Ubertadum. Theodoret.

Sn. H. Lynde p.108; Hey. Art. XXX   Giles. Tit. 7. c. 3

"Jewish ordin. admin. Xt, Gosp. rel., commun. Xt. When Xt. hung upon cross it was high noon; no shadow.

L
See Heb. IX, 28, X. 10. 12 (where διηνεκες goes with θυσιαν)
Very perfection of Xts' consist. in not being repeat.!
If And transub. would be necess. — While priest
cannot do more than Xt did. But we can
should expect it to be sacrificial from
the Jew. feast. And from Mal. I. 11. Our
Lords Prayer at the 1st Ep. is sacrificial.
His remembrance. Shew forth Lords death. There
is this — by Priest alone — to God. And
there is an offering of praise & thanksgiving.
And of soul & body by each believer. II
Of course others are not benefited or souls departed.
Comm. of Pr. alone not primitive III IV
In reg. to language, Rom. inconsist. for the
orig. lang. of Latin Ch. was Gk.
III Comm. in one Kind. Rom. doct. Art 6
Cr. Pius; Trent Sess. 13, Can. 3. Cf. Const. Sess.
13; Trent Sess 21 c. 2. 3. "All" prophetic in
words of instit. Ex. P. I Cor. X. XI. Conc. Const.
admitted practice of early Ch. was against them.
IV Sir H. Lynde, p. 80, Old Liturgy. Puseys Letter to Bp. Ox. 2
Dr. Hey on Art. XXIV. Gibsons Preserv. Tit 6. c. 3. Hook on Mass.
III Acts ii, 42. XX 7. I Cor xi.
II Bp Hey & Bev. on Art. XXXI; Brevint on Rom Mass. Waterland
III Sir. H. Lynde, p. 80; Coseys Test. &c; Laud agst. Fisher, Ox. ed.
1839, p. 256 Theoph. Am. p. 223 Gibs. pres. Tit. 6. c. 2.
I Past. Lett. H. Bish. '44 Report on practices in Comm. off. in
Conv. Journal 1847 (Bp. Brownell P. B)

So these people always run back to the historical Xt, & forget his living Lordship.

Beyond these, if ~~the~~ a man avoids Trans. & Zwing, a man, holding these points, may meditate on the mystery, but there is a whole series of very dangerous questions leading to irreverent treating. Point in mystery beyond which man has no sort of right to go.

1. Before God

εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν

2. No pres in virtue & efficacy, but the sacramental presence may be.

In Heb. Faith & Repent. lead on to obedience, Bapt & Conf. lead to Lords Supper, resurrection & judgment & eternal life. It is a matter of discipline when it is to be administered, — we do not condemn other Churches. Never held that Conf. necessary for Holy Comm. In early Ch. only by Bp. (as Bp. W. thinks).

Seab. says Xt offered himself under symbols of bread & wine

(And some theory of hovering of body & blood above)

II Lutheran & (Calvins).

1. Allows subst. remains. 2. Xts humanity, ubiquity and present, but His Human. & Divin. Verges on Eutychianism. See Browne & Hey.

III Zwinglian. Breaking & pouring recall to the memory the death, & the moral nature is benefited, as looking on a picture.

IV Art. XXVIII. XXV. Cat. Lords Supper.

1. Euch. a mem. of Xts death. Emmer. R.
2. Bread & wine off. to God. " "
3. "the Body & the Blood"
4. But, not corporally but sacramentally & representatively
5. We rec. Xst spiritually pres. – His Body & Blood
6. By wh. we mean to include all the benefits of his passion.
7. None rec. the benefits of Xst's passion exc. prop. qual. Art. XXIX.
8. This pres. of Xst, only in soul in virtue, efficacy & grace.
9. Wrought in & by the Holy Gh. I

V Confirm. Heb. vi. 1, 2 cf. Ac. viii: 14–17, XIX–1–6.
Obj. ip. mirac. eff. wd take away nearly all Xty. Antiquity gives evid. for 1500 yrs.
Calvin admits III instituted & retains, but be a ceremony.

II Wheatly on Com. Pr. Dr. Hull on Confirm. Bing.
Bk XII. Storrs Ch. Man. W. Morris Test. & Confirm. Bp. Seab. Serm.

I Cosin's Hist. Trans. Cleary Test. Ratramn.; Jewel; Waterl. Coleridge on Eng. Ch., Hook. V; Seab. on Euch. (Sermon)
Brownes references.

St Paul enumerates wisdom, knowledge, faith as great men; after these the miraculous; after 1 Cor. xii. 28 & three offices; Apostles, prophets, teachers;

II did not involve I (graces), & our Lord says rejoice not in this rejoice not but that names written in Heaven, & so Cor. xiii, I have not charity. So with Antichrist. But if I then we admit II, III follows & Catholic

So III, ordinary gifts do not imply I.

So people say a man must be a good minister, because I, & that age & morality authorise a minister.

Irvingites have no *witnesses & only for believers.

Mr. Andrews "you do not believe, so you could not see miracle" But St. Paul says of tongues, for unbelievers.

Want still a Good Book on Office of Holy Sp. with Patristic references, &c. — the Vicarious Headship. Owen's Doct. Theol.

Mannings Book is to prove Infall. of Pope & makes a jump saying Tradition & Pontiffs indefectibly are infallible, no more.

"Holy Spirit said unto them", Act xiii. 2, &c., & Act xx. 28

6 Holy Ghost, *life of everything in kingdom of grace* linking union with our Lord. | Xt is the Head of Church[I] - but the Holy Ghost is His vicar in Ch; & by His operat. & agency the work of redemption is carried on.[II]
By His Miss. the H. Gh. becomes Παράκλητος.
But diversities of gifts, &c.[III]
I Sanctifying, completes forgiveness & justification[IV]
II Miraculous[V]
III Ecclesiastical[VI] [VII]
Theory of Archd. Wilberforce ab't our union with Xt has blended & obscured agency of Hol. Sp., though there is much very sound in his book on Incarnation
In talking with people be careful about meaning capacities, it is same word.

VII Wilson's Pref. & his Perp. Govt. Heber's Bamp. Lect. Simeons Off. Hol. Sp. Hares Miss. Comf. S. & n. L. II.7.
VI Joh. XX, 22 Ac. XIII. 2 XX. 28 Leahing Serm.
V Luk. IX.1 X, 19, 20 & Booke of Acts
IV Confirm. off. Cf. Is. XI, 2
III 1 Cor XII. 4-6 Read thro' chap.
II Joh. XIV. 16.26; XVI. 7 cf. XV. 26 Ac. I. 4, 5; 8; Eph. ii. 18 seq.
I Eph. I. 22, 23 V.23

Triads of the Druids – Williams on the Cymry p 26–28

7 Three things it is impossible that God should not perform; what is most beneficial, what all want most, & what is most beautiful of all things

23 The three necessary incidents of humanity, to suffer, to change, & to choose. — . . .

24 The three equipositions of humanity; inchoation & felicity; necessity & liberty; evil & good; all equiponderate; man having power of attaching himself to one or the other.

30 In 3 things man unavoidably differs from God; man is a finite, God is infinite; man had a beginning, which God could not have; man not being able to endure eternity, must have in the circle of felicity a rotatory change of his mode of existence; God is under no such necessity, being able to endure all things, & that consistent with felicity.

56 The three necessary essentials of God, infinite in himself; finite to finite comprehensions; and coeunity with every mode of existence in the circle of felicity.

Topic II. 2d thread. Invocation of Saints, to pray for us, being in Heaven. Bps. are not professing in Heaven. We can hardly imagine that the saints do not pray & remember those on earth.
All H.S. proof alleged comes from Old Testament & yet the O.T. ~~Saints~~ were not in heaven then. Argument from N.T. is that we ask saints here to pray for us.
Implies ubiquity of saints. So they cannot hear. Directly against doctrine of Early Ch. Present apostrophes are different.
Letter of Smyrna Ch. about Polycarp is clear. In Rome now Te Mariam almost always used for Te Deum. The old Breviaries are only used now in Convents. No more old Roman are employed than in Baptists
Mary now stands between us & Xst. See Pusey's Eiren. Bergen said now they say in Rome they never weary of Mary; they don't care whether ~~they~~ ~~pray~~ ~~for~~ Xst or not. He is angry now & it makes no difference.
Palmer's 5th letter to Wiseman. Browne 17 less. Prim. Xtn. worship. Bergens Lett. fr. Rome Pusey's Eiren. Ref. Dr Horne's Mariolatry.
Bp. W: feels that departed cannot know about us. And those who ~~have passed~~ attain to Resurrection cannot know ~~about~~ the destiny of those who do not. Dives & Samuel knew nothing but what the ~~...~~
St. Alp. Liguori says "All things even God are subject to Mary".

[right margin, vertical:] apparently cannot & when cannot

Gen. Resurrect.

1. Anal.

2. Difficulty as to atoms need not be considered. Atoms & personal identity distinct. Objection of Physiology answered by physiology.

My body the same as ten years ago & not the same. Resurrection body same & yet not the same. So is explained our Lords scars. 1 Cor. XV. shows that the body will greatly differ. Ch. does not object to holding that God puts on us a different ~~& new~~ body, & yet there must be some continuity.

Cowes Hulsean Lect. hist. on Res. Reason insists ~~for~~ on same atoms.

3. Judgement

Lately a school in our Ch. has given up idea of judgement. Eanties. Explain the creed as meaning "Then shall he come to reign over the quick & dead" Wicked annihilated.

Antichrist to arise, take Jews & Judaea, restore Ritual, & animal sacrifice & this beginning of end. These sacrifices acceptable to God. Xt comes & heads an earthly army & at Armageddon a regular fight & Antichrist destroyed & wicked annihilated. Rank heresy.

So they hold the judgement according to works relates somehow they say to the

distinction between Jew & heathen.
Trouble in trying these men to
that dioceses only have power of
trying & presenting, & hoped at next
Convention, to rectify this.
Styled "Eschatology" 17
Seven great signs. ~~men share interpretatively & acquiescingly.~~
1. Matt. xxiv. 14 Bp. W. not sure that ~~thru of~~ preaching Gospel to every single tribe is meant, but to all Roman Empire before destruction of Jerusalem. So this may relate to antitype as other verses
2 Fulness of Gentiles & raising Jews
3
4 II Thess 2. Falling away & Man of Sin

Son of man in Heaven
Earth pass away
Angels & Trump
(Possibly) Elias appears in person.
(words on Millennium) in Apocalypse
Reason on Creed

While taking notes people kissed the cross

Insane cease [illegible] mind often before death. Dr [illegible] – [illegible]

Etherization has remarkable effect. Patient is perfectly conscious of operation but seems to be apart something outside of themselves. The patient says "I was there when you did that"

Difference of existence shown by the description of mans creation

All live unto him

Dives & Lazarus

Into thy hands I commend my spirit

Lord Jesus receive my spirit

Spirits of just men made perfect

Souls under altar

Spirit of man goeth upward

(all taken it for granted)

We have no point in common with Romanists. The Rom. [illegible] Rome ends [illegible] Saints & Heaven & mortal misery & Hell, but a heaven that will [illegible] H.S. very [illegible] [illegible] about future state.

In Cincinnati – immense numbers of Spiritualist have gone to Rome.

Most conversions in Ohio.

Ch. Fathers for Taylor, ~~[illegible]~~ visions proved Purg.
Eng. Greek spread abroad idea of Purg.
Ch. Fathers 1750, proved by miracles.
"Purg. proved by miracle. S. Johnson."

Here Romanists talk abundant & have masses; but how practical does not appear.
No possible objection to prayer for dead in gt ~~that they~~ may rise.
1. to pray for advance of a soul.
2. to pray for resurrection
No hint at purgatorial prayer.
Eastern Ch. holds progress but not purgatory.
Dr. Jarvis copied out 1835 what a man could do by getting up in early his Coliseum Gross
Ech 200 days of kissing cross
S. Pudens, get 3000 years indul
& 1/3 sins. Recite prayers (Tra coeli) lib. [illegible]
& 200 days
30 cents get a mass for [illegible]
Mam. Prism 1200 years [illegible]
years indulg. & 30 cts will [illegible]